

COBBETT'S WEEKLY POLITICAL REGISTER.

VOL. 79.—No. 6.]

LONDON, SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 9TH, 1833. Price 1s. 2d.



PROCEEDINGS IN PARLIAMENT.

Bolt-court, 7. February, 1833.

EVERY eye is directed towards, and fixed upon, the proceedings of the reformed House of Commons. This is the first time within my recollection of an adjourned debate on a king's speech; but, if the debate had not been adjourned, a debate on *such* a speech, it would have been to proclaim to the people that nothing at all had been gained by reform. For what is this speech? Not one word of sympathy does it express for any part of the sufferings of the people; not one word in the way of holding out hope to them in the way of seeing better times: no promise of gentle government; no promise of merciful treatment; no promise of redress for past wrongs; no promise of justice for the future; a hint that the peace has been *tolerably well kept in England*, and a further hint that it was well for the people that they had kept it. Those who look well at words will see a great deal more of the threat than of the promise in these words. A great deal of sympathy is expressed with regard to the *Portuguese*! most anxious desire to prevent civil war amongst the people of that country; but no such sentiment with regard to our brethren in Ireland; but, on the contrary, a call on the Parliament for *additional powers*, powers beyond not only the laws of England as they now stand, very freely extended in point of severity; not only an addition to these laws; but an addition to the laws of Ireland, which

most people thought incapable of admitting of additional severity. In short, it is just such a speech as preceded the green bags and the bills of 1817; just such a speech; and, with the omission of the green bags, the proceedings would, in all probability, have been much about the same had it not been for the amendment proposed by Mr. O'CONNELL. In that case, however, there was a green bag filled with papers of some sort or other; and represented to contain proofs of a treasonable conspiracy. The bag was not opened to the House, but to a secret committee of the House selected by CASTLEREAGH and his colleagues. A secret committee reported to the House that it was right to empower CASTLEREAGH and SIDMOUTH to shut up in dungeons whomsoever they pleased; gave them the power to do that, and that power they instantly began to put in execution. But, as I said before, there was the *show* of having grounds for the proceedings. In this case there is nothing but a bare statement, and a very loose statement, too; and of that statement made by the advocates of the speech, not one single syllable remained undenied and undisproved, as far as disproof could be given in such a case. The short and the long of the matter is this, the Irish people are resolved to pay tithes no longer to a Protestant church. That church has an immense revenue in tithes and in lands: it is easy to be seen that the lands must follow the tithes: it is an immense mass of public property all fallen together: we maintain (I do at any rate), that this property belongs to the public, and ought to be taken for public uses. It belongs, in fact, to the nobility and gentry, partly English and partly Irish. It is enjoyed by their families, and is as much theirs, in that respect, as if it was so much of freehold property. An attempt has been made, and is making, partly by forms of law, partly by other sort of force, to compel the Irish to desist from their purpose of

refusing to pay tithes. The law has been made more and more severe, more and more prompt, more and more "vigorous," to use a favourite word of Lord GREY, but still all has been found insufficient, and now additional powers are called for, and this reformed House of Commons is called upon, as its very first act, to give those additional powers, which is precisely what CASTLEREAGH and SIDMOUTH called for when they had already prepared their bills of 1817. The precise nature of the measures to be adopted does not appear to have been yet stated to the House of Commons. The Ministers were several times asked to be explicit upon this point, but always evaded it. They were told that they intended to take away the trial by jury, and to *suspend the act of Habeas Corpus*. They were repeatedly told this; and not a man of them denied that it was so. They did not declare in the affirmative, to be sure, but not a man of them denied that such was their intention.

Now, then, what is the real object of this terrible measure? Why, to compel the Irish people to submit quietly to the payment of tithes. If, when these acts are passed, any man be known, or be suspected of being hostile to the payment of tithes, he has no security for his person for a single moment. He has no jury to protect him against any accusation, be it what it may, or come it from whom it may. He may be sent to a jail and into a dungeon at any moment, without cause assigned, and there he may be kept at the pleasure of those who send him thither; and for what is all this? Again, I say, to compel the Irish people, tamely and quietly, to submit to the payment of tithes. And, now observe, it is not upon Ireland only that this is intended to operate, it is upon England also; for, it is to tell the people of England that if they do not submit to pay tithes, that *they shall be dungeoned and treated in the same way that it is now intended the people of Ireland shall be treated*. This is the great question now at issue: will the reformed House of Commons, or will it not, consent to these horrible measures

with regard to Ireland, in order to compel Catholics to pay tithes to Protestant parsons, and thereby make it consistent in them to punish the Protestants of England for a similar refusal to pay tithes? This is the great question now at issue: it is now Thursday noon. The question may have been decided before this *Register* shall go to press; and, therefore, the people will have an early opportunity of judging what they are to expect from this reformed House of Commons. So completely is the public mind absorbed in what is now passing in the House of Commons; and about the result of which every soul is anxious, that it would be throwing away time to address my readers on any other subject. The money affairs must soon come on, and then we shall see what is to be done for the relief of the people as well as for the relief of Irish parsons, who seem at present to be such very interesting objects of compassion. I cannot conclude this article, however, without expressing a wish that every man in England could have heard the speeches of Mr. O'CONNELL, Mr. GRATTAN, and Mr. SHEIL, and also of Mr. BARRON, and, indeed, of all the Irish members. Several of the English members, particularly Mr. HARVEY, have spoken in a good spirit and ably; but there wanted nothing but to hear the Irish members to be convinced that they have no need to come to this side of the water for somebody to take care of their concerns. The Ministers went away wholly from the subject of the speech; assumed that the Irish wanted a total separation from England, and argued against such separation; did not attempt to show why they ought to be punished for such wish even if they had entertained it; but upon that assumption, and that assumption only, justified that part of the speech which has caused all this delay in passing the address, and which is to cause further delay still; because it would be eternal disgrace to this reformed House of Commons if there were not men enough found in it to make use of all possible means to give the people time well to weigh the consequences of

such a dreadful measure as is suggested by this part of the speech from the throne.

In the House of Lords, the Earl of RODEN, who has the amiable humility to be the *searcher* of one of the ports in Ireland, I believe, who opposed the Reform Bill, and who protested against it, expressed his high approbation of that *part of the speech which related to Ireland*. In the House of Commons no member amongst those who are called the conservatives appears as yet to have spoken upon the subject, nor has any one appeared to testify his intention of doing so; but, that which I told my hearers last autumn throughout all the north of England and throughout a great part of Scotland, will now, my readers will see, be verified to the very letter; that is to say, the two parties will cordially unite for all the purposes necessary for the upholding of the present system. They must unite; it is impossible for them to proceed without uniting. If they do not unite, then Ministers will soon be left in a minority, and then what is to follow?

5. February, 1833.

It is my duty here fully to record the proceedings upon the opening of the reformed Parliament, not merely considering it as a matter of curiosity, but as one of the greatest importance in itself, and as it may affect this kingdom in future. My readers, and all those who have gone with me in sentiment on political affairs for these last thirty years, have been regularly warned by me to look forward to a day of considerable anxiety and even peril not to be averted by any but those timely measures which I have proposed and urged, without ceasing, for a space now of nearly thirty years. They have watched the course of events, and have, from time to time, seen verified the predictions that I have made; and they therefore are not unprepared for the future, who have without surprise beheld the past.

We have obtained, by the most strenuous efforts, and by great per-

severance, that reform which I and others have long pointed out as the means of effecting the necessary changes in our system of Government with the greater chance of peace than we could hope for without it; or, at least, we have obtained a good deal towards a *real reform*. But it is upon the proceedings of the House of Commons this very week that will depend mainly whether the people shall look upon this reform as a mere delusion, or as a something capable and willing to do them the services that they justly anticipate from it; and I will here give my readers a record, as full as my limits will allow, of those proceedings. It will be recollected, that, as soon as the Reform Bill was passed, many men throughout the country who were well acquainted with the tricks of electioneering, and of hollow politicians of great professions who gained seats in Parliament by pompous protestations which they took good care not to realize, began to think of a mode whereby they might *test* candidates for seats in Parliament, and as far as possible create a unanimous feeling throughout the country to send to the House of Commons none but men who would pledge themselves to propose or support certain specific measures on which the mind of the country was already determined. The proposition was catching amongst the people, but not so amongst the candidates; each thought his *honour* might be depended upon, and, though agreeing with the people in sentiment, wished to be left unshackled by pledges. It was laughable to observe the craft of some, the intemperance of others, and the impudence of many, on having tendered to them the test of political faith; but, notwithstanding an almost universal dislike of the pledges, many candidates were compelled to take them in order to secure their seats.

In a very few days it will be obvious to the whole nation the wisdom of having exacted the pledges that they did exact, and the absolute necessity of doing so again upon every occasion where it has come to a unanimous decision upon any main topic. We shall now have put

upon record the names of those who deserve the confidence of the country and of those who do not; and I beg again and again to remind my readers that they should keep a constant eye upon the proceedings in this House. It is now upon its trial; it is now going to show its character, its kind, and, if it disappoint the nation which has sent it together, let the nation examine wherein the fault lies, and take timely and efficient resolution to prevent the next from doing so likewise.

I shall now insert the King's speech, as delivered from the throne by his Majesty in person on this day; and a more important, and, to my mind, more injudicious document never was presented to any Parliament of England. It is not much, to be sure, that ever was expected from Whig wisdom, Whig justice, or Whig clemency; but in this speech there is such a signal want of the whole three, that I cannot but look upon it as a sign that those intestine jarrings of the Cabinet that some have hinted at are real, that this is the patched-up mess brought out to satisfy disagreeing minds, and that it is a prelude to the breaking up of Lord Grey's administration.

THE KING'S SPEECH.

" My Lords and Gentlemen,

" The period being now arrived at which the business of Parliament is usually resumed, I have called you together for the discharge of the important duties with which you are intrusted. Never at any time did subjects of greater interest and magnitude call for your attention.

" I have still to lament the continuance of the civil war in Portugal, which has for some months existed between the Princes of the House of Braganza. From the commencement of this contest I have abstained from all interference, except such as was required for the protection of British subjects resident in Portugal; but you

may be assured that I shall not fail to avail myself of any opportunity that may be afforded me to assist in restoring peace to a country with which the interests of my dominions are so intimately connected.

" I have also to regret that my earnest endeavours to effect a definitive arrangement between Holland and Belgium, have hitherto been unsuccessful. I found myself at length compelled, in conjunction with the King of the French, to take measures for the execution of the treaty of the 15. Nov., 1831. The capture of the citadel of Antwerp has in part accomplished that object, but the Dutch Government still refusing to evacuate the rest of the territories assigned to Belgium by that treaty, the embargo which I had directed to be imposed on the Dutch commerce has been continued. Negotiations are again commenced, and you may rely on their being conducted on my part as they have uniformly been, with the single view of ensuring to Holland and Belgium a separate existence, on principles of mutual security and independence.

" The good faith and honour with which the French Government has acted in these transactions, and the assurances which I continue to receive from the chief powers of Europe of their friendly disposition, give me confidence in the success of my endeavours to preserve the general peace. I have given directions that the various papers which are necessary for your information on the affairs of Holland and Belgium should be laid before you.

" The approaching termination of the charters of the Bank of England and of the East India Company, will require a revision of these establishments, and I rely on your wisdom for

making such provisions for the important interests connected with them, as may appear from experience, and full consideration, to be best calculated to secure public credit, to improve and tend our commerce, and to promote the general prosperity and power of the British Empire.

"Your attention will also be directed to the state of the church, more particularly as regards its temporalities and the maintenance of the clergy. The complaints which have arisen from the collection of tithes appear to require a change of system, which without diminishing the means of maintaining the established clergy in respectability and usefulness, may prevent the collision of interests, and the consequent derangement and dissatisfaction which have too frequently prevailed between the ministers of the church and their parishioners. It may also be necessary for you to consider what remedies may be applied for the correction of acknowledged abuses, and whether the revenues of the church may not admit of a more equitable and judicious distribution.

"In your deliberations on these important subjects, it cannot be necessary for me to impress upon you the duty of carefully attending to the security of the church established by law in these realms, and to the true interests of religion.

"In relation to Ireland, with a view of removing the causes of complaint which had been so generally felt, and which had been attended with such unfortunate consequences, an act was passed during the last session of Parliament for carrying into effect a general composition for tithes. To complete that salutary work, I recommend to you, in conjunction with such other amendments of the law as may be found

applicable to that part of my dominions, the adoption of a measure by which, upon the principle of a just commutation, the possessors of land may be enabled to free themselves from the burden of an annual payment.

"To the further reform that may be necessary, you will probably find that, although the established church of Ireland is by law permanently united with that of England, the peculiarities of their respective circumstances will require a separate consideration. There are other subjects hardly less important to the general peace and welfare of Ireland, affecting the administration of justice, and the local taxation of that country, to which your attention will also be required.

"Gentlemen of the House of Commons,"

"I have directed the estimates for the service of the year to be laid before you. They will be framed with the most anxious attention to all useful economy. Notwithstanding the large reduction in the estimates of the last year, I am happy to inform you that all the extraordinary services which the exigencies of the times required, have been amply provided for. The state of the revenue, as compared with the public expenditure, has hitherto fully realized the expectations that were formed at the close of the last session.

"My Lords and Gentlemen,"

"In this part of the united kingdom, with few exceptions, the public peace has been preserved; and it will be your anxious but grateful duty to promote by all practicable means, habits of industry and good order amongst the labouring classes of the community.

"On my part, I shall be ready to co-operate to the utmost of my power, in obviating all causes of complaint, and in promoting all well-considered measures.



asures of improvement. But it is my painful duty to observe that the disturbances in Ireland, to which I adverted at the close of the last session, have greatly increased.

"A spirit of insubordination and violence has risen to the most fearful height, rendering life and property insecure, defying the authority of the law, and threatening the most fatal consequences, if not promptly and effectually repressed.

"I feel confident, that to your loyalty and patriotism, I shall not resort in vain for assistance in these afflicting circumstances, and that you will be ready to adopt such measures of salutary precaution, and to intrust to me such additional powers as may be found necessary for controlling and punishing the disturbers of the public peace, and strengthening the legislative union between the two countries, which with your support, and under the blessing of Divine Providence, I am determined to maintain by all the means in my power, as indissolubly connected with the peace, security, and welfare of my dominions."

In the House of Lords a debate ensued, principally on foreign affairs; but in this matter, when compared with the affairs that press upon us at home, the interest is so trifling that I shall not crowd the columns of this *Register* by inserting any part of that debate, which was carried on by Lords ABERDEEN and GREY, the Duke of WELLINGTON, and Lord RODEN. There was, however, a tail-piece to Lord GREY's speech, in which he pronounces words of awful import to Ireland, and which, as it is materially connected with the important debate that was then going on in the Commons, I shall here insert, just observing that, to those who remember Lord GREY's words when he let slip the special commissions of 1830, nothing is

required from me to excite their attention to the words that I will now quote.

"Passing therefore from these, he should now apply himself to the latter part of the speech which had been delivered from the throne. Of that part which related to the necessity of employing strong measures towards Ireland, he should not then trouble their lordships at any length. When the measures which the condition of that country rendered necessary were introduced, he should have an opportunity of laying before them more at length the views upon these subjects which were entertained by his Majesty's Government, and he would then state the grounds upon which they thought it would be their duty not to shrink from the task of bringing those measures before Parliament. He need scarcely tell the House, that it was a duty which the King's Government felt they owed to themselves and to the country to see that the authority of law was upheld in that country, that the safety of property was maintained, and that every attempt at disorder was put down, and that, above all things, measures should be taken to put an end to the delusion which prevailed respecting the legislative Union, any successful attempt to put an end to which could not but end in the ruin of both countries. In order, therefore, to give the fullest effect to these sentiments, he should not fail at an early day to lay before them such measures as the necessity of the case might seem to require, in perfect confidence that whatever might be required would be readily conceded."

In the House of Commons, and before the speech of the King was read to the House, there were several notices of motions given by different members; some upon subjects of great interest: namely, by Lord ALTHORP, notice that on Tuesday next he should move for leave to bring in a bill to amend the state of the Irish church establishment; and that, on the 14. he should bring in one to erect corporations in several towns; and on the same day he should move for a committee to inquire into

the state of existing corporations. Mr. GROTE gave notice that, on the 28. instant, he should bring on the question of the *ballot*. Mr. O'CONNELL gave notice of motions for the *abolition of vestry rates in Ireland*, for the *extinction of tithes in Ireland*, to amend the *Reform Act*, to amend the system of *Irish registry and lay corporations*, for reform of the *grand jury laws of Ireland*, to amend the system of *special juries and juries in criminal cases*, and to give the Irish people the *common law right of choosing magistrates*. Mr. WILKS gave notice that on the 21. of March, he should move for leave to bring in a bill to prevent *Parliament sitting more than three years*.

The speech delivered by his Majesty having been read, Lord ORMELIE moved the address, which is usually a set of complimentary phrases, thanking the King for his gracious speech, and promising to comply with the suggestions of it. The anomaly here to be remarked is, that, the speech itself is always avowedly the speech of the Ministers, and is recognised in no other way according to the usages of the constitution, which holds the King blameless in every act that he does, and throws on his Ministers the blame of every act that is blamable; and yet it has become of late the practice for the very Ministers who have written the speech, to write the *address in answer to it*. They come down with their speech in the King's hands in the one House, and in the other with their answer to it in the hands of two members selected by themselves; and to make the thing conspicuously queer, these two members are dressed up in court dresses for the occasion. So that, this time, we had Lord ORMELIE in dress regimentals (he being an officer in the army, I suppose), and Mr. MARSHALL of Leeds, with his bag-wig, ruffles, and sword! Our ancestors did this affair in quite another manner; and it is curious to observe how the ancient forms remain stalking before our eyes, as it were like the ghost of our constitution, to remind us as it mocks us, how puny we are compared with the learned, energetic, and public-

spirited men who left us what we now see we have lost. It was formerly the practice to pass a short formal vote of thanks for the speech, immediately after the Commons had returned from hearing it in the House of Lords, but then the House *fixed a future day for taking it into consideration*. A committee was then in reality appointed to draw up an address to his Majesty, that committee reported its proceedings to the House, and brought forward an address which it recommended the House to adopt. The House went into debate upon the report, and rejected the address or not, as it thought fit.

How reasonable, how methodical is this mode, compared with that which has crept into use during the sway of boroughmonger Parliaments! And, is it not our duty, bit-by-bit at any rate, to bring back the wholesome and excellent practices of our forefathers, that we may have the benefits of the working of that constitution which they left us, and which the reformed Parliament finds so marred, so disjointed? We have been constantly reproached as innovators, as men who wished to pull to pieces, who aimed at overturning the constitution. Many fools, to be sure, have sputtered out their nonsense on us in these terms; but many worthy and even sensible people have given way to the delusion from not knowing what they talked of. It is to get back our constitution that we have been so long at work; it is that we really may have the excellent institutions of our country that we have petitioned and prayed, and suffered punishment from the crafty and greedy tyrants who have denied our just prayers. We have now made great progress towards our object, and I hope that not even the spirited debate that is now going on will end before the present House of Commons will have convinced the people of England that it contains men of capacity sufficient and of inclination good enough to lead the way in a complete restoration of our constitution, and a thorough redress of our grievances. I shall be greatly disappointed if this be not the case; and I am quite sure that, if I am right, it will

be impossible for craft, intrigue, ferocity, hypocrisy, or all these together, and with the aid of any other diabolical agents that corruption may turn loose upon us, to prevent a steady march of the public mind in support of those who have public spirit and courage enough to speak out in corruption's face; and who are sufficiently disinterested and free from vanity to set its blandishments at defiance.

The reader will find below a selection of the speeches which were delivered by the Ministers on the one side, and by the opposition on the other, on the two first nights of this memorable debate. It will be seen that, after the mover and seconder of the address had done, Mr. O'CONNELL rose, and without preface, denounced the address as "brutal and bloody" terms, that shocked Lord JOHN RUSSELL's ear, and that caused the Speaker to hint, at Lord JOHN's suggestion, that the language was not the usual language of the House. It should be recollected, however, what was the situation of Mr. O'CONNELL at the time of using this language. He comes from his native country, his mind teeming with her grievances, his heart depressed at her sufferings; and when, instead of hearing from the grand ministerial document of the session, that her wrongs are to be redressed, and her sufferings alleviated, or at the very least, that they are duly known and deplored; when, instead of this, he hears from that document that HE amongst others is called upon by it to give "additional powers" to rule the sufferers who have sent him to protect them from what they already bear, and which he knows to be power sufficient; when one considers these things, it is a mockery of refinement to affect disapprobation of the terms employed to convey the indignation that any man of common public spirit could feel upon such an occasion. But we have become so refined of late, that vice itself must have a new and a pretty name. Why, one *word* is not more ugly than another; there is no bad smell about a *word*; nor is there any *word* unclean to the touch. Why, then, hate a *word*? If

Mr. O'CONNELL had called it a *sanguinary* address, no one's ears would have been offended, because though *sanguinary* is the Latin word for *bloody*, it is not so well known to be so as to raise the idea of gore in our minds at the first hearing. I have always admired the sentiment of BOILEAU: "*J'appelle un chat un chat*," &c. And accordingly, if you would praise, make use of the terms that are most likely to excite the admiration which you yourself feel; if you would excite indignation or loathing, make use of the terms that are best calculated to call up such feelings.

Mr. O'CONNELL's speech was more full of invective than any that I ever heard; and I confess that I heard him with great pleasure, being fully persuaded that he was speaking the indignation and reproaches of a man who really felt the wrongs that his country has laboured under long, and seems destined still to endure. He related a string of grievances that no man of just mind could hear without going along with him in the sentiments that he expressed, and almost in the conclusions that he drew; and, though I have never yet given my approbation to a repeal of the legislative union between England and Ireland, I do not hesitate to say, that I would rather see not only the act of union repealed, but all connexion cut off, than see that unfortunate country oppressed and wasted as it has heretofore been. I would not vote, therefore, for a repeal of the union, until I am told plainly that *the grievances of Ireland are to go unredressed*; but, if I am told that, then I will vote for the repeal.

Mr. O'CONNELL was answered by Mr. STANLEY; and, as this is the defence of the Secretary for Ireland, I have given it at full length.

Mr. GRATTAN's speech I have also given as I find it reported. I wish I could do him the justice that the newspaper reports have not done him. His speech was admirable. It was spoken with such rapidity that it was hardly possible that reporters should follow him; and, for the sake of the public, this I lament. It was a speech full of point and of most important facts; it was a

real answer to the Secretary for Ireland, and it produced a great impression upon the House. I wish every Englishman; every prejudiced ignorant man who has nothing but "*blood-thirsty*" on his tongue (spite of the delicacy) when he mentions Ireland, and who fancies the whole nation one rebel mob; underserving of any government but that of soldiers, jailers, and hangmen; I wish that every such man in England could have heard the detail of enormities that Mr. GRATTAN described as being daily practised upon this miserable people. I wish it, because it would have quelled the prejudices that have been sucked in from early times, and always fostered by crafty politicians who saw their own interests furthered by national antipathies. It would have roused a sense of *justice*, which is no respecter of persons, and thus it would have taken from craft and selfishness the prey that has so long been its own. However, let us hope that the day is now come when the people of England will be taught *through Parliament* that justice to Ireland is not less wanting than justice to England.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.—Tuesday.

Mr. O'CONNELL said he rose to oppose the address; he thought it a brutal and a bloody address. It was a declaration of civil war against Ireland—it was an address which would occasion many a wail—it was such an address as had been put forth in the case of America, where, also, with brutal perseverance, said the hon. Member, you sent your secretary to write your orders in blood; but now, as then, your perseverance in sanguinary councils will terminate in your utter disgrace. Again I repeat it—this is a brutal and a bloody address. When I hear the noble Lord, the Member for Perthshire, tell us that a reformed House of Commons will be more attentive to the affairs of Ireland—when I hear the hon. Member for Leeds talk of attention from an English legislature to the concerns of Ireland, and tell us how much better under the coming state of things, the conduct of

men in office in that country will be watched; when I remember how much was expected there from this session of Parliament; I can readily conceive the bitter laugh of scorn and derision with which the speech and the address will be read in my country. They will be considered as they are—a declaration of civil war. Let me ask this question: Why was it that my country was cast as a spoil to this secretary? We had been told in his Majesty's last speech before the dissolution of Parliament, that measures were in progress which would tend to retard the increase of crime. I beg that his Majesty's speech on closing the last session previous to the dissolution of the late Parliament be read as far as it relates to Ireland.

Here the clerk of the House read the passage, which was as follows:—"I have still to lament the continuance of disturbances in Ireland, notwithstanding the vigilance and energy displayed by my Government there in the measures which it has taken to suppress them. The laws which have been passed in conformity with my recommendation at the beginning of the session, with respect to the collection of tithes, are well calculated to lay the foundation of a new system, to the completion of which the attention of Parliament, when it again assembles, will of course be directed. To this necessary work my best assistance will be given, by enforcing the execution of the laws, and by promoting the prosperity of a country blessed by Divine Providence with so many natural advantages. As conducive to this subject, I must express the satisfaction which I have felt at the measures adopted for extending generally to my people in that kingdom the benefits of education."

Mr. O'CONNELL here stopped the clerk, and continued: I would ask, then, this right honourable Secretary for Ireland this one question. How comes it that a country which has been blessed by Divine Providence with such advantages as Ireland has been—a country which possesses such advantages as (I do not say Scotland only), but such advantages as even England does not possess equal; how comes it that this is a country (with respect to which Providence is blasphemed when we term her advantages blessings); how happens it that where Providence has done so much, her rulers have done so little, or so ill? How is it that her landlords flourish and her farmers starve? That her people

are so poor, her church so rich? After seven centuries of misgovernment to which my country has been subjected, is this to be our remedy? Is there to be yet another cry for blood? If Irishmen had had the management of their own affairs; if all the disorders had taken place under Irish management, then, indeed, might there be some excuse for having recourse to force; but when I hear the noble Lord talk of disorders which have arisen while you have been governing for us; when I hear you complain of us after seven centuries of misgovernment on your part; I throw back on you the charges which you lay on us; to you I impute our miseries, and on you redounds our shame. If it is so: it is your misgovernment which has caused our disorders; force will but increase the evils. There is but one remedy—to do justice. I ask again: Why is it that Ireland has fallen as a spoil to the right hon. Secretary? The noble Lord (Ormelie) the member for Perthshire, has condescended to make a speech. A speech, too, received with much applause by many in the House—the noble Lord has condescended to make a speech *at me*; he has poured forth the vials of his wrath on my head—insupportable infliction! In these times there is no passing any one that walks the street, no scion of the inferior or superior nobility, who does not venture his sarcasms on Ireland? I have suffered this infliction; but I throw it back with scorn. Why, again I ask, has Ireland been left as a spoil to this Secretary? Is Ireland now more quiet? On the contrary, have not crimes increased tenfold? On this point all parties are agreed. There is no difference of opinion on that subject. The only question on which it is possible for us to differ is, how it is that crimes have thus increased? (Great cheering). Whence have those disorders originated which we all know have spread so wide, and are still spreading? There are two modes of accounting for their increase. The one is that which has been adopted by the noble Lord, the mover of the address. He attributes all Ireland's errors and all Ireland's crimes to me—to me,

the agitator. (Hear, hear). Such has been the language of the noble Lord. Oh! do not these right honourable Gentlemen on the opposite side know that they themselves, but last year, were as loudly accused, as they now accuse me, of this same crime of agitation? Last year you were the agitators of the people of England. They, the people of England, said your accusers, did not desire those revolutionary changes which you wished to introduce, until your agitation almost stirred them to rebellion. Not one of those terms is there, of which the noble Lord is so liberal—there is not one which he has applied to me, which was not then, and with equal propriety, applied to the right hon. Gentlemen on the other side. Then they treated these terms with contempt. With contempt, then, do I treat such terms when they are applied to me. Oh! have these crimes, indeed, arisen from agitation? They have been created by misgovernment—not by agitation; they have been created by deeds—not by words. Many have been the terms of reproach which the noble Lord has heaped upon me. The noble Lord calls me a bird of prey, and asks for my co-operation in measures for quieting Ireland. Is it, then, a bird of prey that is to be called upon to co-operate in the tranquillization of Ireland? Am I to quiet Ireland? Has not the noble Lord seen the right hon. Secretary for Ireland in that country for two years; and what has he done during so long a period of suffering and of crime? Nothing. He has given to-night some notices on the subject—some rhodomontade of a Grand Jury Bill—some measure for increasing the constabulary force; and whether I be a bird of prey or not, I know that these are not the measures which will quiet Ireland. It cannot be worth while, indeed, to ask counsel of a bird of prey. When the noble Lord shall have done as much for his country—for Scotland—as I have done for mine; when he has found it filled with factions, and changed it into an united people; when he has agitated, as I am happy to think that I have done, and to as good effect; when he has done all that, then let the noble

Lord presume to assail with such language a better man than himself, whatever difference in their opinions there may be. Every passenger in the streets in these days, lards his sentences with sarcasms on Ireland. I reject the terms which he applies to me with indignation and scorn. They prove his disposition to be injurious, but they prove nothing more. What he says of me on the subject of agitation is neither bright nor novel; every term which he has used, and far more, was familiar to me during the time of agitation. All the noble Lord's metaphors, and his birds of prey, are light, compared to some of the epithets to which I was then accustomed. The conduct of his Majesty's Government will cause me to agitate again. Ministers are agitating for me, and far more than ever. Ireland has arrived at that state of inanition which generally precedes the political death of a state—a state which can be cured only by the sanguinary remedies of a civil war. The repeal of the Union is a measure which is now necessary, not only for the good of Ireland, but for the safety of the King's throne. Hon. members last year were in the habit of talking of the repeal as a thing so distant, so improbable, so impracticable, that it scarce deserved a moment's consideration. This year all parties in Ireland are reconciled to it. Formerly the right honourable Secretary used to talk of it as a subject which would never become a serious question; nobody now denies that it is a subject which requires discussion. It would be more advisable in any case, if the subject must be put down, that it be by moral truth, and not by force. If any man will say that agitation has produced the present state of Ireland, he is totally ignorant of what every statesman ought to know—the history of the country which he governs. The whole history of Ireland proves that agitation has not been the cause of the evils in which it has been involved. I have proof, ancient and modern, of this fact; and if I am told otherwise, and have to do with men who cannot have read even their own history; if they be right, and can so prove

it, then agitation ought to be put down; if not, is it just that England should once more be called upon to send an additional force of bayonets and of bullets into my unfortunate country? Ireland must continue thus to be governed by force; and if there was a time when it was not so governed for these 700 years, I do not know who has discovered it. It was so in the time of Henry VIII., when only a portion of the Irish were the king's subjects. It was so in the time of Elizabeth. So ignorant are many of the history of Ireland, that they are not apprised that a great portion of the Irish were not the King of England's subjects till the year 1614, in the reign of James I. During the time of the present Administration, what but evil, after all their promises, has been done to my country; more lives have been lost while they have governed it, than during the administration of the Earl of Strafford. Every post brings fresh accounts of some miserable Irishman assassinated by a policeman or a soldier at noontide, or murdered by some miscreants at night. To-day the newspapers contain an account of such a murder. In the county of Mayo, some men were shot lately for singing a song in the presence of some policemen. Another man was stabbed to death in Queen's County, for an equally trifling offence. At a meeting in Kanturk, policemen in coloured clothes were sent among the people, and the soldiers, with their muskets primed and loaded, were marched upon them; but the soldiers had no pretence for firing, in consequence of the peaceable conduct of the people, till a policeman in coloured clothes threw a stone at a soldier. The soldier followed the policeman, and seized him. Seven witnesses swore to the fact of his throwing the stone; yet it was with great difficulty that any magistrate could be found to sign a warrant for his committal; and the grand jury ignored the bill of indictment. This is the justice which is meted out to Ireland. To show the character of my countrymen, I will mention their conduct with respect to one of that body (the police), who are

so obnoxious, particularly to the lower classes of the Irish; and to show the treatment which my countrymen too often receive, I will mention the reward of their kindness. The policeman took shelter in a poor cottage, and appealed to the generosity of its inmates. They received him—they took care of him—they put him in bed—his pursuers inquired at the cottage—they denied him—they came a second and a third time—the same denial! They awoke the policeman when the danger was over, and put him on his road. Another party of police came, and accused them of concealing him. They laid hold of, and handcuffed them. They handcuffed the wife: but she was a poor Irishwoman; she was no Mrs. Deacle. Less was done to Mrs. Deacle, and all England (and very properly) rang with it. The least attempt at resistance to oppression in Ireland is but the signal for another slaughter, and yet more force is called for. What is the cry, but a cry for blood? If you want to send more soldiers to Ireland, you want to give more opportunities for shedding blood. Four cases of wilful murder have been found against soldiers and policemen. I say his Majesty's Government are the cause of these crimes. Yes; I accuse his Majesty's Government of the slaughter at Newtownbarry; for they it was that put arms into the hands of these men, and gave them the weapons with which their victims were slaughtered. The right hon. Secretary has already conquered Ireland by force; he has conquered it with foot and horse and marines; he has turned the barracks into stores for tithed articles, in spite of the people of Ireland. By force he has been successful already. Why then talk of adding to the force in Ireland? Is agitation the cause of the crimes which I have mentioned, or is it the conduct of the Government? Nor is agitation the cause of the Whiteboys, which are proved to have been committed by the lowest and poorest of the people. It has been proved that these outrages have no connexion with any political measure whatever. Nay, more; I defy the right hon. Gentleman

(Mr. Stanley) whether there ever was a time of agitation in which there was not a cessation of Whiteboy outrages. The hon. and learned Member here alluded to the friends which Ireland possessed among the Scotch, in a remark which we did not catch precisely. He then continued as follows: There was no period, not even the present, in which Whiteboyism was more prevalent than in the years 1821 and 1822. Was that a period of agitation? On the contrary, upon the accession of George IV., as well from his professions on other occasions as his promises of doing something for the relief of Ireland during his visit to that country, we determined to wait till we should see what would be done for us spontaneously. And agitation ceased entirely for about two years; yet during this time the Insurrection Act was put in force, in consequence of Whiteboy outrages in no less than eleven counties; and at the time when the Catholic Association was first formed, eighteen counties were in a state of disturbance; before the Catholic Association had been in full agitation eighteen months, every county in Ireland was exempt from its operation. Now I would call upon those who are such advocates for shooting my countrymen, to contradict that fact. I call upon them to account for that circumstance I am speaking of, and for unhappy Ireland. I ask why an Irishman is to be treated differently from Englishmen or Scotchmen? An Irishman is not that silly thoughtless creature which your farces and your plays have taught you to consider him. He is shrewd and sensible. Seven centuries of oppression have taught the nation to watch the signs of the times, and when they see any prospect of obtaining legal redress, they give up all other means by which they at other times seek to better their condition. This is the cause why Whiteboy outrages and agitation never exist together. When Ireland shall have no grievances left, then Whiteboy outrages will cease, and agitation will cease. What new cause is there for sending force to Ireland? Has not every tithe meeting been already put

down by bullets and bayonets? Perhaps Ireland is not yet sufficiently oppressed. My parish contains 12,300 souls, of which 75 are Protestants. Is it no grievance that twelve thousand two hundred and odd Catholics should pay tithes for the support of the clergy of these 75 Protestants? The Members of his Majesty's Government may call me agitator, and may ascribe to my agitation the increase of crime, which I deplore. They forget that no government ever agitated so much as they have done. The increase of crime is not the result of agitation, but crime is the consequence of the continuance of our grievances; and agitation also, as it ought to be. What care I for the sneers or taunts of the noble Lord (Ormelie)? If Ireland continues to have grievances I think myself bound to agitate, and I will agitate, until a third Algerine Act shall be passed. If you pass another such, then indeed, and then only, you put an end to my agitation; but if you should attempt it, it will take many and many a long year before you will be able to put it into execution. We contend for liberty, and to protect ourselves from those who seek our blood. The Irish, notwithstanding the many calumnies with which they have been assailed, are an honest, a moral, and a religious people. There is more religion in Ireland than in any country, not excepting that of the noble Lord. Even the Whiteboy outrages are no proof any bad trait in the national character. My countrymen will never, in any struggle, act contrary to that character; but I will present to the House such a catalogue of grievances as will justify me in appealing to them, whether, if these be continued, an Irishman has not a right—is not bound to agitate. First, in the list of these grievances, we have to complain of a magistracy unconnected by feeling or religion with the people. Let us suppose, for a moment, that this were the case in England; how would Englishmen brook a magistracy of foreigners? If England had a gentry unconnected by feeling with the people, from whom all her magistrates were selected; suppose the power of enforcing her laws

to be vested in Frenchmen, what indignation would not be felt? How soon would they be resisted? It is true that laws have been passed with a view to protect the poor in cases of injustice on the part of magistrates, but these laws have assumed so many forms, and been subject to so many alterations, that no action could possibly be successfully maintained against a magistrate by a poor man. I need not hinder you long in proving this. I have been anticipated in my argument by the right hon. Gentlemen on the opposite side. It was part of their stock in trade while in opposition; they always promised that this was to be redressed when they came into power. When Lord Manners went to Ireland, the last words the King addressed to him were, "Attend particularly to the revision of the magistracy." What was the result? A great many magistrates were certainly struck off the list; a great many who were dead were struck off; a great many Catholics were struck off; and, lastly, a great many improper persons certainly were struck off; but this did not last long. The improper persons—those who had been insolvent and others—were speedily reinstated. They had the ear of the castle. It appeared from the evidence of General Burke, that an excuse on another occasion for not purging the magistracy, was, that the period for renewing the lists being at hand it would be better to have their turn-out at that time. In short, the right honourable Secretary for Ireland had done, during his administration, something with the Irish, he had succeeded in making them unanimous; all parties of them concur in one thing; they all agree in their hatred towards him; they all join in that cry. He has probably, been sent to Ireland on the same principle as the Earl of Kildare, who, "as no one could govern him, was sent to govern Ireland." The proceedings of the magistrates in petty sessions give them a complete impunity for every act of oppression exercised against the poor. Their deeds are not the acts of an individual but of the board, and they are sure to support each other,

to that a poor man has no means of obtaining redress. Those things may to some members of this House, perhaps, appear trivial; but to those who are under the operation of such laws, they are matters of vital import; and still more so when we consider that the jurisdiction of those magistrates has been extended, not only to criminal matters, but to trying the titles of the property of the poor. The Trespass Act has been made use of to usurp this power. I may be told that the poor man has his redress by application to an equitable jurisdiction and keeping possession; but I know a poor man who was fined for such a proceeding. It is true the statute says a magistrate must not try rights; but a poor man cannot pay the costs of the law. I do not accuse all the magistrates of injustice, nor even a majority of them; but I do accuse a very large and a very influential class among them. There are thirty-four stipendiary magistrates in Ireland who are appointed by Government, and out of these Lord Anglesea appointed twenty-six; and not one of them was a Catholic. There were also thirty-two sub-inspectors of police, only one being a Catholic. With such a magistracy, if suffered still to subsist, was there not ground enough for agitation? Ireland had long looked with anxiety to the first meeting of a reformed Parliament. Oh! what will be the cry when this brutal and bloody speech shall be read there?

Lord JOHN RUSSELL rose. I move that the words of the hon. Member be taken down.

Mr. O'CONNELL. If these words are declared by the Speaker to be out of order, I do not persevere in them. I will give no opportunity against me by my words. I will use the gentlest lady-like words. I withdraw the expression. The speech is not a brutal and a bloody speech.

Lord JOHN RUSSELL. I do not object to any word used by the honourable and learned Gentleman; but I object to the application of any such terms to a speech which his Majesty has uttered.

Mr. O'CONNELL. This is a question

from which I do not shrink. I do not know the rules of the House so well as the noble Lord. If I am wrong, I will not persevere in the use of these terms; but if I am right, I feel bound to persevere. I always have understood, that upon constitutional grounds, the speech is to be considered and may be spoken of as that of the Minister. If the Speaker shall declare me to be wrong, if the speech is to be considered as the speech of the King, my lips shall be sealed; but if I am right, if the speech is to be considered the speech of the Minister, the terms which I have used are not strong enough.

The SPEAKER then stated his decision as follows: "As the honourable and learned Gentleman has applied to me whether, upon constitutional grounds, the speech is to be considered that of the King or that of his Ministers, my opinion is, that the speech is to be considered as that of those who are responsible for it. The honourable and learned Gentleman is, therefore, right as to the point of order; but I put to himself whether the decency which is required for the order of the proceedings in the House can be maintained when such words are made use of."

Mr. O'CONNELL proceeded. Were not the grievances which existed in Ireland such as to call for any reprobation of the conduct of those who, instead of redressing those grievances, called for additional powers to repress the discontent which they had occasioned? Was the administration of justice in Ireland in a state in which there was nothing to complain of? Was it not well known, that for twenty years the patronage of the bench in Ireland had been invariably exercised with a reference to political opinions? Was it not well known, that during that period all those who signed petitions in favour of the emancipation of the Catholics, by that act virtually excluded themselves from office in Ireland? Was it not well known, that if any man had so declared himself the friend of Catholic Emancipation, he was compelled to make the *amende honorable* before he could stand the least chance of forgiveness? When the Irish people saw all this; when they saw, that although their judges could not be rewarded in their own persons for their political bias, they were rewarded in the persons of their sons or their nephews; if by such means they saw that the judges, although they could receive no direct increase of their incomes, received the indirect increase, which the saving of the money which they must otherwise have expended in the

support of such sons and nephews occasioned, it was quite impossible that they could have any confidence in the administration of justice in Ireland. (The learned and honourable Gentleman here alluded to several instances; but we were unable to collect his statements with sufficient accuracy to venture upon stating them). Adverting to the appointment of Mr. Dogherty to the office of Chief Justice of the Common Pleas, he observed, that that learned judge had, except in one or two cases, conducted himself with more propriety than any judge on the bench. But it was absurd to talk of the independence of the judges in Ireland. They might be independent of being operated upon by fear; they could not be struck off the list; but they were not independent of being operated upon by hope; they were not independent of the expectation of reward, if not in their own persons, in the persons of those who were immediately connected with them. There would be no confidence therefore in the administration of justice in Ireland, unless it were an established principle (there might be no harm perhaps in extending the principle to England, although, as he had not a sufficient knowledge of the facts, he would abstain from saying anything on that point) that there should be no such indirect mode of rewarding the judges in that country as those which were at present resorted to; that there should be no employing in the public service their sons and relations, who would not be employed in any other service; that there should be no conferring on such persons a great deal of public money, while requiring from them a very small amount of public labour. Another cause of complaint in Ireland to which he would now advert was the jury system. (Hear, hear, hear). Was it supposed that the people of Ireland were contented with the existing system on that subject? The noble Lord opposite had promised them last year that they should have a bill on that subject similar to that which had been passed with reference to England seven or eight years ago. That promise, however, had been broken. And why? Should he be told that the measure was not as necessary for Ireland as it had been found to be for England? Why, therefore, had it not been given to Ireland? Was it not as desirable in Ireland as in England that juries should not be composed of partizans? For seven years, however, Ireland had been left in the state from which England had been rescued; and when last year the poorest boon that could possibly be imagined, a mere prospective measure had been introduced, in spite of the promise of the noble Lord opposite, even that petty measure had been thrown out in the House of Lords. At present the Crown lawyers had absolutely the power of selecting the individuals of whom the juries were to be composed. He was a living witness of the fact, and could prove it incontestably. He could prove it in the case in which, although a man who had committed

no offence was driven down to the ground by four or five lancers, it was denied that they had committed even an assault. Let the House consider what an enormous political power was conferred by the existing system. The sheriff returned the panel; and although by a statute the power had been taken from the Crown under certain circumstances peremptorily to challenge, the Crown was allowed to set aside individuals until the whole of the panel had been gone through; by which means it in fact enjoyed all the benefit of a challenge. Never was any practice carried to a greater extent than this practice of selecting juries was carried by the Crown lawyers in Ireland. The indecent use of their privilege in that respect had filled the country with affright. Who had been the foreman of the jury by whom Mr. Costello had been convicted in Ireland? An individual who had been much before that House. After adverting to several instances in which this practice had been carried to a most scandalous extent, the hon. and learned Gentleman said he would proceed to other grievances. One of the most prominent was, the severe Star Chamber sentences which had been pronounced in Ireland. (Hear, hear). Was it not enough, for instance, that the proprietor of the *Waterford Mail* had been sent to jail, and sentenced to pay a heavy fine, but must the working printer be also punished? Was not this oppression? In agitating Ireland on the subject of the tithe system, his Majesty's Government in that case had run before the agitators. Public meetings on the subject of tithes had been put down as conspiracies. Everybody knew the notions of what constituted a conspiracy which had been held by high legal authorities. The opinion which had been maintained on that point by Lord Ellenborough had since been overruled by other judges: for on these subjects the judges seemed to make the law. But not satisfied with actual conspiracies, individuals had been indicted in Ireland for enticing persons into conspiracies. And in one instance a person had been tried on an indictment for being present at a public meeting tending to a conspiracy. Was this the course which would be pursued by a Government wishing to possess the fraternal affection of a people? To indict people not only for a conspiracy, but for enticing persons into a conspiracy, and for attending a meeting tending to a conspiracy,—the conspiracy itself being all the while a constructive offence! No such thing could ever be attempted in this country; but anything was thought good enough for Ireland by this reforming Government! Another great evil under which Ireland laboured was the grand jury system. (Hear, hear, hear). They had been told it was to be remedied; but he did not know how. The evil was, that a class of men, appointed by the sheriffs, had now the power of taxing their neighbours, without those neighbours being represented. One of the consequences of this system was, that the roads

in those parishes and baronies in which the grand jurors resided were kept in high order at the general expense; while they were altogether neglected where there were no rich residents. These grand juries had power over a full sixteenth of the landed revenue of Ireland. The taxation in question was imposed by persons selected by the sheriffs; and such a batch of conservatives as had this year been appointed by the Government had never before been witnessed. What was the fact with respect to the office of sheriff? That only one Catholic gentleman had been appointed to that office, while it had been filled by nineteenth of the Protestant gentry in Ireland. Was not that a great grievance? It had been admitted to be so even by the right hon. Gentleman opposite; for he had talked of applying a remedy to it. And yet with such a grievance in existence the right hon. Gentleman and others talked of agitation! Why impute to agitators the discontent for which there was so abundant a cause without them? By these grand juries the people were taxed without being represented. Now that no man should be taxed without being represented, was a great fundamental principle of the constitution. Still, however, his Majesty's Government persevered in their course; and still they would persevere, until they had driven Ireland to despair by such "triumphant majorities" as they no doubt would have that night. Another great grievance in Ireland was the lay corporations. Was not that a great grievance? Would not the right hon. Member for the University of Cambridge allow that it was so? The right hon. Gentleman would, he was sure, concur with him in opinion on that point. He would concur with him in thinking that the enormous monopolies created by these lay corporations were a great grievance. Look at the corporation of Cork. That corporation had at its annual disposal no less than 74,000*l.*; a sum greater than the whole civil expenditure of the United States. It was exclusively a Protestant corporation. So it was with the corporation of Dublin. Talk of the bigotry and exclusiveness of the Catholics! Let them show him a single Catholic body which had exhibited so much bigotry and exclusiveness as these Protestant bodies. There were none such. For forty years Catholics had by law been admissible into these corporations; but during these forty years not one had been admitted. The penal law had been repealed; but the bigotry and exclusiveness of individuals had supplied its place. What was the consequence? The corporations appointed the sheriffs, the sheriff-selected the juries; so that in Dublin, all great state questions, and all questions having reference to taxes or property, were determined on exclusive principles. Was all this nothing? Was it not a fact that the persons appointed sheriffs, were obliged to drink a certain toast as a pledge of their conduct? He (Mr. O'Connell) had drunk that toast (a laugh); but he had not drunk it in their

sense; and he hoped that in the sense in which he had drunk it, it would be unceasingly drunk in Ireland. But in all that he had been describing, was there nothing to complain of? He did not say that he attributed all these evils to his Majesty's present Government. Although the Whig party in all times were more deeply stained with political offence towards Ireland than any other party in the state; yet the members of his Majesty's Government were not responsible for any but their own acts. But when they called for more power, they, by that act, adopted all the crimes of their predecessors; instead of calling for fresh power, let them do justice to Ireland. (Hear). Let them put down the demand for a repeal of the Union by showing that that repeal was unnecessary to the prosperity of Ireland. Did they make any such attempt? No, they called for cannon—for horse; they filled their arsenals—they demanded greater powers. The next grievance of which he would complain was the armed police in Ireland. By the maintenance of that police, the Irish Government had stained itself with blood. The question was, first, whether a police ought to be armed. It might be necessary on some particular occasion that they should be armed, but they ought not to continue so. Yet this force, so armed, was constantly augmenting. Where the police were exposed to any violent attack, they ought to be prepared to meet it; but were deadly weapons to form a part of their daily dress? Was there to be no market or fair in Ireland without the presence of an armed police? What was the consequence of such a system? That the slightest and most accidental opposition to the police in Ireland was punished with death. In England the constable had only his staff, but in Ireland he had his musket and bayonet; and any man who in a state of drunkenness, or in the pressure of a crowd, offended him, was punished with death. But he knew how little many hon. members cared for Irish blood, and with what sovereign contempt they listened to these statements. He would repeat, however, that to arm a police with deadly weapons, and, instead of apprehending and prosecuting a violator of the public peace, to punish him on the spot with death, was a gross and horrible outrage. Nothing could be more dangerous than the army of yeomanry in Ireland; it tended to the increase of crime. Now, though crime had increased in Ireland, it had not arrived at its acme. It had been restrained by the strenuous advice of the calumniated agitators. The armed yeomanry had, however, been increased from twenty-two thousand to thirty-one thousand. And what had since happened? That the Catholic population in the north of Ireland had armed themselves. The country was in consequence a volcano. A tremendous force was prepared to enter upon a servile war. The Catholics were adopting this measure in their own defence. He was ready to mention to his Majesty's Mi-

nisters the name of a magistrate who in the course of last week had seen a secret meeting of a thousand Catholic peasantry, well-armed, in the north of Ireland. This disposition was spreading, and would spread widely. How did his Majesty's Government meet this evil? By going on with the system which had created it; by demanding greater powers. Did they think that any powers they could obtain would meet such an evil? Did they think that any act of Parliament would have the effect of dissolving the secret meetings to which he had been adverting? Did they think that the Catholic peasantry would be induced by any money, by any temptation, to betray their cause? They demanded power to put an end to these evils; and they prevented the agitators from putting an end to them, and from restoring peace and happiness to Ireland. He scorned to ask the House to disbelieve the calumnies heaped upon the agitators in Ireland; but this he would tell them—that they might gag those agitators with their Algerine Acts; they might send them to prison by suspending the Habeas Corpus; they might shed their blood on the scaffold: under that scaffold the Catholic peasantry would assemble, as they were already assembling in the north of Ireland; and would prepare to engage in a servile war of the most dreadful character. A revolution would be effected; not a moral revolution, not a political revolution, but a sword revolution. In the mean time, what were his Majesty's Government doing? Endeavouring to put down public meetings in Ireland. Had any meeting taken place in that country half so numerous as the meeting at Birmingham? With one exception, there had not been a single breach of the public peace at those meetings. Yet against those peaceable meetings his Majesty's Government had commenced a crusade. He would ask the hon. Member who had seconded the address with a modesty of manner which did him great credit, whether he really thought more power ought to be given to men who had shown so much anxiety to suppress meetings at which there had been no violation of law—at which no assault had been committed—but which had quietly separated, on being required to do so? He would venture to express his perfect conviction, that if the honourable Gentleman to whom he alluded knew Ireland as well as he (Mr. O'Connell) knew it, that honourable Gentleman would be an infinitely stronger agitator than he (Mr. O'C.) was. Although he knew it was in many cases absurd to say, *post hoc, propter hoc*; yet it was an undoubted fact, that whenever agitation ceased in Ireland, crime had extended itself—and that whenever agitation was extended, crimes had ceased. Some great and crying grievances in Ireland remained to be enumerated. Was the vestry cess no grievance? Was it no grievance that seventy-five Protestants in a parish should have the power of punishing, by taxation, twelve thousand Catholics? Was it no grievance that the Catho-

lic inhabitants of a parish ten miles from Waterford, in which Lord Duncannon was the only Protestant resident, should be thus treated? In the parish of St. Andrew's, in Dublin, the Protestant vestry had made an additional allowance of 300*l.* a year to two Protestant curates. This was a violation of the law; and the order to that effect having been brought before the Court of King's Bench, was quashed. But what was the result? That at the next vestry a rate was levied on the parish for the payment of the costs of the trial, and the order for the allowance was repeated. Thus the matter remained: the Catholic parishioners finding that it would be less expensive to consent to the illegality than to dispute it. Such were the acts which his Majesty's Government required additional powers to enforce. Let them first do justice. Why should the Catholics be compelled to pay Protestant clergy? Why should the Catholics be compelled to build Protestant churches? Before the ascendancy of the Protestants in Ireland, there was a superabundance of churches in that country; but the Protestants had sold them, or let them go to ruin; and now they called upon the Catholics to repair the consequences of their neglect and misconduct. Was there any agitation equal to this? Look at the temporalities of the church, and say if any thing could be more monstrous—if any effect of agitation could be so pernicious as this system? The living of the brother-in-law of Earl Grey had been estimated to bring in nearly 30,000*l.* annually; there were 96,000 acres of ground belonging to it. Was this paid by members of the church of England? (Hear, hear). No; the Presbyterian and the Catholic—worshippers in a different form, were compelled by this most monstrous system to pay this divine. They were eight millions, and there were one million of Protestants, at least it was said so. Well, there might be one million, but he did not believe it. Was it to be borne that they were thus to be treated? What he wanted to know was this—was the church to be cut down? (Loud cries of hear). They were agitators, it was said; but their agitation was of a clear character; it was of a different sort to that which was the real source of the distress and the insubordination, and the what not. He did not know that it was distinguished by two equalettes (hear, hear), or by troops to cut down the people. Force was the cry. This had ever been the government conduct. For forty years, let it be remembered, force had been unceasingly talked of to Scotland; but Scotch broadswords were unsheathed; Scotchmen knew their rights; they rallied; they united; they struggled—and they succeeded. (Cheers). He did not ask for supremacy: he wanted no supremacy then, and if talked of hereafter, he would resist it (hear, hear); but he did strongly contend against the present unfair and harassing system, and insisted on its abolition. (Hear). Did not the Ministers promise it? (Hear, hear).

Then let them do it. He (Mr. O'Connell) wanted to know, were tithes to continue? (Hear, hear). He wanted to know, was there anything in agitation so vicious as that system? The Turks even, cruel and harsh as they were, despised such oppression towards the Greeks; they never insisted on their support of the Mahometan faith. The Ministers, however, of England were worse than the Turks. He meant to detain the House a little longer on the subject of absenteeism. When speaking of crime, he wished they would look to absenteeism—to the rents which were constantly going out of the country. Would they litigate that? He would tell them they could not. Did Ministers wish to push them on to a servile war; would they compel them, with the devotion of a Falkland, to join criminals because greater criminals were arrayed against them? They called out "force." Why not begin? Why not postpone the threat and do justice to Ireland; and then, if agitation continued, if insubordination showed itself in midnight plunder and outrage, call out for "force." Wait for this—try it, and then, if it failed, take the excuse, and he would support the cry. (Hear, hear). He wanted nothing but justice for Ireland, and justice this country had never rendered to her. That speech which had been delivered was a prototype of one in the reign of Elizabeth, when Raleigh slaughtered the garrison of Merbeck. The cry of power had ever been the cry of this country—and under it were committed those English crimes which were written in the blood of Ireland. Strafford, the prototype of the hon. Gentleman, acted otherwise; he confiscated the property of two entire provinces in Ireland, and when juries refused to convict, he sent them for two years into Dublin Castle. In the reign of James the Second, eighty thousand acres of land were forfeited in defending the right of his father. In the present day the same part was acted; the scene was somewhat changed; the actors were different; but their conduct was substantially the same. There was no real amelioration—no change—nor any intended, as was proved in that address which he had designated as bloody and brutal. What he wanted was a general committee, that that address might be duly considered and discussed line by line. If that were really a reformed House—if justice to Ireland was really their object, they would not refuse it. (Hear, hear). Justice had not been done to Ireland by the Reform Bill. He strongly doubted if he had done rightly in supporting so strenuously the English bill. He had received hints from several quarters upon the subject; but he had supported it, and that unflinchingly. Ireland, in her bill, was not used anything like so well as England. The blunders were solely attributable to Government. The Duke of Wellington took away the franchise; they (the Ministers) found that injustice when they came into office, and they sanctioned it. (Hear, hear). It was no idle motive which

made him anxious to introduce so many of his family into that House. He too well knew the incurable ignorance which there prevailed on the real state and wants of his country, and he was determined to tell them trumpet-tongued to all. (Hear, hear). The number of repealers returned would at least give the Government some insight into the sentiments of the people on that subject. (Hear, hear). He wanted a committee of that House. He desired that that declaration of war with the people of Ireland should be modified. (Loud cries of Hear, hear). Let the Ministers give them a strong and emphatic declaration of intended justice to Ireland (repeated cries of hear); and if then they applied for force, he would support them. But the speech promised nothing. (Hear, hear). There were still several points untouched—there were the prosecutions, to which he would not then advert, and twenty other topics on which he could say much, but he would abandon the intention. He knew he spoke in vain—he felt he made appeals which would fall unheeded on their ears. He should now know of what that reformed House was composed—he should see the high and independent members for England voting for "more power." It was of no use his pleading before a reformed Parliament in behalf of Ireland—it was vain lifting up his voice in her cause, for he was sure his answer would be a laugh at himself, and a laugh at his country. Were then the grievances of Ireland not real? It was well known they were real, heavy, and intolerable; and if so, was it not the duty of the Government to redress them? He would defy any one who had heard his words—who had taken notice of his statements—to instance one case in which he had aggravated a grievance (hear, hear); and he would defy any one to find a people, look where he might, who had agitated, or who had been guilty of midnight outrage, of insubordination and reckless crime, without real grievances. (Loud cries of hear, hear). He had done—he thanked the House for the patience with which he had been listened to—they were the last hope, the last refuge of his country. To them he could only look for relief from the autocracy of the right hon. Gentleman; from that *sic volo, sic jubeo, stat pro ratione voluntas* to which his country was subjected. Whether Government was to be administered by the right hon. Gentleman alone—whether all was to continue to be concentrated in his self-sufficiency—they must decide. Seven centuries of misrule had been endured by Ireland—Government had been carried on on no other plan than that of Tamerlane; and the most outrageous cruelties had been inflicted on a prostrate people. For himself, he (Mr. O'Connell) laboured under one calamity—that of a supposed personal hostility to the right hon. Gentleman opposite. Had he, could he have any such feeling towards him? They had never come together, and he denied any cause for such feeling, and its existence. His were

public grounds. He looked at the accumulation of crime—at the quantity of blood increasing as it flowed in his unhappy country, and he still found him the Lord of the Ascendant, dictating to the Ministry the measures to be pursued. These things he wanted altered. He asked for the real grievances of Ireland to be redressed, and then he would go any lengths the ministers might require. (Hear, hear). The learned Gentleman concluded by moving, as an amendment, for a committee of the whole House to consider his Majesty's speech.

MR. STANLEY. I am convinced, sir, that the House will bear with me, while I trespass for as short a time as I can upon their attention in making a few observations, and that they will feel that in the duty I owe the Government, of which I am a member, it is impossible I should remain silent under the eloquent and forcible invective, for I cannot call it argument, of the hon. and learned Member for Dublin. (Hear, hear). I am not surprised that the hon. Gentleman who has just sat down should have entered into those calculations, into which he has gone rather in answer to the speech which he expected might fall from the hon. and learned Member for Dublin, than to that which the honourable and learned Gentleman has actually made. I am not surprised that he should have anticipated that on a question like this, a question of the legislative union of the two countries Great Britain and Ireland, which has been placed in issue by the speech from the throne, the hon. and learned Gentleman who has held forth that the repeal of the union is the only remedy for the evils of Ireland, that within twelve months a Parliament shall be held in Dublin, that that alone would relieve Ireland and press the Sassenach. (No, from Mr. O'Connell). No, does the hon. and learned Member say? Will he deny that every syllable he has breathed forth—that every word he has spoken—that every sentence to which he has given utterance, has had that for its object? (Hear, hear). Will he deny, that with words of conciliation falling from his mouth, with the breathings of peace upon his lips, his speeches have tended to excite the feeling, that as long as Ireland is subject to a foreign yoke, there is no hope for her happiness, no chance for her peace, no possibility for her elevation from her debased and degraded state, and that in the repeal of the union alone can she hope for these advantages, and shake off these evils; and that in freeing herself from Saxon dominion was to be found her only hope for peace, tranquillity, and happiness? I say, that after all this, we may well be surprised to hear such a speech as that which has fallen from the honourable and learned Gentleman, especially when we come here and ask him to meet us before the assembled Parliament of Great Britain and Ireland upon this question of repeal; and we say, that with all the powers of the Government, and with all the energies of the people, without which the

Government would be nothing—his panacea is one we will resist to the death. (Loud cheering and cries of "Bravo!" in the House; some of the persons in the gallery were beginning to applaud, but were instantly checked by the officers). I tell him, that it is one which, as the death-blow of the empire, we will resist—we will do so, as we wish to strengthen that empire at home and abroad—as we wish for united councils and enterprises—and as we wish, that whenever we are called on to exercise our strength, we may bring into operation the united strength of a great empire. As we wish for each and all of these things, and viewing, as we do, the repeal as the death-blow to the peace, the strength, and the security of the united empire, we should be traitors to our country, if, with every means which the power and resources of this great country affords, we did not say we will have no separation. (Loud cheering). When we call on the hon. and learned Member to meet us on this subject, he rises and addresses his speech less to those within than to those without the House. (Hear, hear). He makes the usual declarations, that the statement of the evils of Ireland is listened to with impatience, though nothing can be more convincingly negatived than is that statement, by the patience with which the House has listened to the hon. and learned Member. Yet he tells us of a course of injustice; he charges us with indifference in looking on the state of Ireland, and he enumerates a catalogue of grievances, no small portion of which the Government have announced their intention to meet and destroy. ("No," "Order"). Feeling that he was without support—knowing that he had not in his favour any test of public opinion—that the voices of the majority of the members for Ireland were not with him, the question had been evaded from first to last; and he who was within 12 months to have a Parliament in College-green, does not venture, when the question is proposed to him, to grapple with it in the legislative assembly of Great Britain. (Cheers). I shall endeavour now shortly to follow the honourable and learned Gentleman in the charges he has made; but I must first be allowed to say that there are some which have come with no great grace from him as an Irishman, or as a Catholic, or as an individual, as to the neglect with which the Catholics of Ireland have been treated. He will so far go with me as to admit the accuracy of that portion of the speech which describes the increase of crime and the insecurity of life and property. There has been an increase of burglaries, of robberies, and of murders. I will not read the catalogues, for I will not ask you to believe even that which is officially reported to the constituted authorities. I cannot, however, omit to point out one or two counties in which the system of agitation first commenced, in which it has not been put down by any extreme application of the law, and in which agitation

now prevails to the fullest extent; and I call the attention of the House to the enumeration I am about to make. The two counties are Kilkenny and the Queen's county. In Kilkenny alone, within the last 12 months, there have been 32 murders and attempts to murder, 34 burnings, 519 burglaries, 36 acts of houghing of cattle, and the number of illegal notices and violent and serious assaults, by which I mean assaults attended with danger to life and limb, has been 170. In Queen's county the number has been even more. There have been 60 murders or attempts to murder; burglaries, 626; malicious injuries to property, 115; and serious assaults upon individuals, 209. I have made out this catalogue, which I believe too truly bears out the position in his Majesty's speech, which has not been denied by the hon. and learned Gentleman himself, of the fearful increase of crime in Ireland; and I will now only add one circumstance; that this list, formidable as it is, contains but a small portion of those acts of violence which have actually been committed. These are only those which have been represented to the police; one hundred rewards, amounting to 12,000*l.*, have been offered by the Government, and of these two only have been claimed. So complete is the system of disorganization—so fearful is the discipline of these marauders—so extensive is the connexion of these disturbers of the public peace, that the victims dare not complain; they are compelled to suffer in silence, and, knowing the individuals by whom they have been attacked, to submit implicitly, and without a murmur, to the commands of those whom they know to have the means of death in their hands, and whom I can qualify with no lighter term than that of insurgents. This is the state of things in Ireland. Is it a state in which we can say that the law is respected? I feared almost that we should be taunted by those who, in this House last year, accused us of supineness, and that they should now charge the Government with not having used with sufficient severity the powers they possessed. If that is a fault we must acknowledge ourselves guilty; we were willing to trust to the law—to hope that it was adequate to its purposes; and knowing the evils—the perpetual discords occasioned by a Government going beyond the law, we wished not till the last extremity, to call for extraordinary powers. But placed as we are, even taking the description of the honourable and learned Member himself as to the state of the Catholic population—a description he has studiously put forth, and in which he represents that population as armed, and ready to enter into a servile war (hear, from Mr. O'Connell)—a description which he now affirms by his cheer; but notwithstanding which, he tells us that we ought not to come down and ask Parliament for powers to suppress these disorders till Parliament has remedied, of course to his satisfaction, (a laugh), all those grievances of

which he complains. Why, sir, these grievances are too deeply seated to be remedied by one act of any legislature, however willingly disposed to do so. (Hear, hear). But if you are called on to remedy these grievances, are you to be called on to do so under the terror of a civil war, when life is threatened, property insecure, and anarchy prevails, qualified only by the despotism of some self-styled liberal. (Loud cheers). To call on the British Parliament to remedy grievances in this state of things, is not calling on them to legislate, but to crouch in submission. (Hear, hear). The honourable and learned Member has said that he shall be satisfied with a promise of redress of grievances, and that if that promise is made, he shall not refuse extraordinary powers. In the customary terms of speech, it is not possible for his Majesty to point out more clearly the grievances under which Ireland suffers. But has she suffered from these under the union only? Are these evils of yesterday? Have they been inflicted by the English Parliament alone? Were there no complaints, no disturbances, when a domestic legislature swayed the power of Government in Ireland? (Hear, hear). Were none of these evils originated by a legislature, corrupted, perhaps, by England, and ruled by her power, and compelled to yield obedience to her authority, but existing in all the vigour of fancied independence? Let the task of the remedy be undertaken by a British legislature, not governed, however, by those angry and party feelings which the honourable and learned Gentleman so well conceals under that philosophy with which he addresses this House. Let the care of this Parliament be to examine substantive grievances, to remedy real complaints, but let them do this with power in their hands, and let them amend the laws only while they possess the power of controlling those who live under them, and while the laws are obeyed so long as they are in existence. (Hear, hear). The hon. Gentleman who spoke last, told us an anecdote which excited much laughter among some hon. Members, but which, if looked at seriously, is calculated to excite feelings of the deepest compassion, and to produce a clear conviction in the mind of every man, that the power of England must be put forth for the protection of its subjects. (Hear, hear, hear). Can Parliament bear with indifference that a clergyman, an amiable man, has had his property attacked, his life threatened, his peace disturbed, the happiness and security of his family destroyed, and all this not on the charge of endeavouring to enforce beyond the law the rights to which by law he was entitled—not even for pressing for that which the law would afford him, but, on the contrary, after having exerted the utmost benevolence, and after having devoted one-half of his income in relieving the poor? I admit the evils of the system of tithes now existing in Ireland; but is it conceivable that it should cause such a proscription of a humane and

useful body of men, whose only crime is that they wished to live in peace with their neighbours? Yet this is the case with a body of men brought up in luxury, having the habits, education, and feelings of gentlemen, who have looked to their appointments in the church as a provision for life, on which they have reared their families—on which they have insured their lives, and who have yet been obliged to beg their bread from their friends in consequence of this alarming state of things in the country in which they reside. If it be a crime to wish to protect such persons, I must certainly plead guilty, for I do wish to do it. (Cheers). It may be said that these attacks have been made by the lowest classes. I admit it. I admit, too, that these classes labour under the greatest difficulties from high rents, and from a variety of other causes, for which the hon. Gentleman who spoke last has suggested what he thinks to be a remedy, and that all these causes may have tended to induce some of these parties to join in these midnight outrages; but it is not the less necessary to repress them, for if they have been committed by the lowest classes, they have also been committed upon the lowest classes. (Hear). It is not on the wealthy or the powerful, but on the orphan, the widow, the defenceless, the old, the blind, and the impotent, that are chiefly perpetrated these outrages, which would be disgraceful to a country in a state of half-civilization, and it is for the protection of those who cannot protect themselves that these powers which we now ask, and which I am confident Parliament will not refuse, are absolutely necessary for the protection of their life and liberty. (Hear). The honourable and learned Gentleman says that all will be well if we give them agitation. Can he say that there has been none already? Can he lay his hand on his heart, and truly say that he has given no advice which has led ignorant people beyond the limits of the law? And we are to suffer them still to be misled into the commission of these outrages, when it is on those who are thus deceived, and not on those who deceive them, that the heaviest consequences of these disorders always fall. When magistrates were held up as objects of dislike, and the police of every annoyance, provided it was legal (a laugh)—when resistance to tithes was encouraged, provided it did not violate the letter of the law, and ten or twenty thousand men were directed to assemble to protect a tithe sale—that the sale might be no sale (a laugh)—was it surprising that the honourable Gentleman's exhortations sometimes failed of effect, and that his victims sometimes expiated with their blood the consequences of his advice? It was not extraordinary that they should transgress the limits of the law, when distinguished lawyers were found to have been mistaken in their views of it. (A laugh). The honourable Gentleman opposite, under his own hand and signature—pledging also his professional reputation to the soundness of his opinion—had

declared that a letter tending to excite a combination against law, was not a treasonable violation of any law. Within three weeks a gentleman, himself a member of the bar, under the very statute rejected as quite inapplicable, in those very words, was indicted. The statute was that for which I received some praise from the learned Gentleman last session, because I had introduced an amendment of it—the Whiteboy Act. The gentleman had the advantage of the honourable Member's talents, and what was the advice he got from him? To plead guilty to every count of the indictment. Would he deny it (laughter, and hear, hear! from Mr. O'Connell: I don't deny it, I admit it fully)? That great law authority was deceived, and his letter and conduct were utterly at variance. (Mr. O'Connell denied the statement as to the letter). The honourable Gentleman denies the letter; but I believe I could produce it this very moment. (A laugh). The honourable Member had next alluded to the selection of juries in tithe prosecutions, and to the power which the Crown possessed of setting aside jurors. I acknowledge the existence of the power; but by whom was it used? Why, by the honourable Gentleman himself, at the prosecution of Sir G. Bingham. In Tralee four persons were tried, three were found guilty by a jury composed of nine Protestants and three Catholics; and no man was set aside who was not charged with actual offences, for which those individuals were to be tried. The verdict of the gallant officer I do not impugn; I do not say that situated as he was, he may not have overstepped the limits of the law. But what was the selection of the jury there? It was composed of eleven Catholics (Mr. O'Connell: "Ten"). I was given to understand that the number was eleven; but be it so. There was one Protestant, and seventeen persons were set aside by the much-abused power of the Crown. (Laughter and hear, hear). This conduct called down the reprobation of the judge (Judge Moore), as respectable and liberal a man as any in Ireland. He declared that it was an exhibition he had never before witnessed, and that it was a gross abuse of the privileges of a prosecution. I will now go more at length into the charges against the Whig Government, who have never done anything for Catholics (a laugh), and who have worked more evil and less good for Ireland than any of their predecessors. (Loud cries of "hear, hear!" from the opposition benches). The honourable Gentleman claims the exclusive merit of having effected emancipation. I will say nothing of the taste, the good feeling, or the gratitude this evinces for those who, during so many long years, advocated that measure. For myself, I can say not a word, because I supported it during no more than seven years; but can I overlook the services of those men whose votes and speeches continued to produce increasing majorities in Parliament, until at length the Ministers of the Crown yielded Emancipation? I will now

turn to the charge of not having placed Catholics in places of trust and power. What is the fact? Where is the system of neglect pursued towards the Catholics? Let the House look to the total quantity of legal promotion by the Whigs; let it also look to the previous exclusion of Catholics, and then say whether they had not their fair share of places and offices?—Two sergeants-at-law had been appointed; one was a gentleman of liberal principles, and high in professional character—the present member for Monaghan: the other sergeant was a Catholic.—Two king's counsel had been appointed, and both were Catholics. One was Mr. Wolfe, and of the other I shall say no more than that the distinction was deemed due to his legal and professional character. There had been two assistant barristers; one was a Catholic: eleven clerks of the Crown, of whom four or five were Catholics. There had been one mastership in Chancery, and that was given to a Catholic, a gentleman whose talents and knowledge fully merited it. One cursitor was appointed, and he was a Catholic. These things I state, to show the systematic disregard of the honourable Gentleman for facts (Cheers). He complains, moreover, that there is but one Catholic sheriff. He knows that the sheriffs in Ireland are chosen as in England—that the Government must select one out of a list of three, and generally the highest on the list. If, therefore, there be no Catholic sheriffs, Government is not to blame; it can merely make a selection. But is it not strange that no Catholic can accept office, without being stigmatized and cried down as having betrayed and sold his country to the Government, and this by the very individuals who complain of the exclusion of Catholics from power? The hon. Gent. says that extraordinary powers are unnecessary, because Mr. Barrington, the crown solicitor for the Munster district, says there are no offences perpetrated not punishable by the existing law. There can be few better authorities than Mr. Barrington on that subject. But what avails that when the law cannot be enforced; when it is a mere dead letter; when intimidation has reached such a height, that witnesses will not give evidence, nor juries be found to attend for the trial of offences? If they attend and give verdicts against the accused, their houses are burned, their crops destroyed; and it has been at the same time declared, that this is the vengeance exacted for having solemnly given a conscientious verdict from the jury-box. On the other hand, some (there have been but a few instances of this condescension) have had their crops saved, without the least expense to themselves, because they gave a popular vote for men accused of popular delinquencies. (Hear, hear). Trial by jury was a mockery, where violence and outrage thus prevailed; when there was no hope of getting evidence, even though the real criminals were as notorious as the sun at noon-day. The

hon. Gentleman had charged the English Government with systematic misconduct towards Ireland. For this purpose, he had gone very far, indeed; he had ascended to the times of Elizabeth, and endeavoured to show, that the Saxon Government of those days was the same as the present. He had gone back, not only needlessly and causelessly, but mischievously, and had at length alluded to America, as if she could be a parallel case to that of Ireland. Of what, let me ask, did America complain? Does he understand the question he has alluded to? The Americans complained in being taxed without having a voice in the legislature that imposed the tax—of being thus deprived of the distinctive right and privilege of Englishmen; and it was in such a case as this that they made the last appeal to physical power. (Hear, hear). Will the hon. Gentlemen say that this is a parallel to the condition of Ireland, I grant it might have been so before 1782—it might have been so when the privy council of England controlled as it chose the bills of the Irish Parliament—it might have been so when the Crown assumed the right of disposing of the surplus revenue, without rendering any account to the representatives of the people; but I say that there exists no parallel whatever between both cases, when Ireland possesses her fair share in the Imperial legislature, and is heard with as much favour as Yorkshire or Scotland. (Cheers). The hon. Gentleman says, that none but the King, Lords, and Commons of Ireland, are competent to bind her. I admit that, but they merged in the King, Lords, and Commons, as at present constituted; and the Irish branches of the legislature stood on the same footing with the English and Scotch members of it. As the hon. Gentleman has not touched on repeal, I will not go into that question now. My object is to refute his charges against the Government; though the King's speech has already refuted the most important of them; for how could it, in the face of that speech, be asserted that Ministers really intended nothing on the subject of the Irish church? The amount of tithes, in the face of the House, the hon. Gentleman had asserted—had ventured to assert—was one-tenth of the total produce. Now every witness's evidence went to show—every person who examined the evidence knew, that, so far from being what the honourable Gentleman had asserted, it was not even one-tenth of the rent. Tell me of the commutation in Scotland: there it was calculated as the fifth part of the rent; but we brought in a bill which fixed it in Ireland at the tenth part of the rent; and did more, for we propose a means by which the landlord can get rid of it altogether, by a fair and equitable commutation. I will not enter into the question of alterations made by the bill of last year; but this I say, that without augmenting the ultimate payment, it substituted a fixed sum instead of a growing one, whatever might be the powers of the soil or state

of cultivation, and made it rest finally on the landlord. The fairness of Ministers' intentions, and their anxiety to deal in due time with so important a question, might have been concluded from the motion (of which notice had been given) upon the state of the Irish church, its revenues, and their distribution. (Hear, hear). Upon the motion with which the hon. Gentleman concluded I shall touch as little as he himself did. It was, I presume, merely intended as a vehicle for certain charges, which I have sought to answer; and I will conclude by declaring that we must make law respected and Government feared, before it is beloved in Ireland; and that Parliament is bound to invest Government with those means of coercion which are absolutely necessary. (Hear, hear).

Mr. O'CONNELL rose to explain a mistake or misrepresentation concerning what he had said. He did not complain of the postponing Catholics generally, nor had he imputed the small number of Catholic sheriffs to a fixed design on the part of Government. The real charge referred expressly to the stipendiary magistrates, of whom there were no less than twenty-six. It was in that quarter he said Catholics were thrust into the back ground.

Mr. GRATTAN had never been more astonished or indignant than at the conduct of the Secretary for Ireland throughout. The conduct of Ministers was now worse than ever, when they called upon a reformed Parliament to punish a whole country for the excesses of two counties. To subject the whole of Ireland to penal law, suspending juries everywhere—such a thing was never heard of in England. When the Habeas Corpus had been suspended there, it was on general reasons and minute inquiry. Never, under the most tyrannical reigns, had the most tyrannical Ministry ever proposed such a thing to the most slavish of Parliaments. As to the present speech, it was a poor, meagre speech; unjust, unworthy, and artificial. The whole intention was to stop the question about the union; but this could not be done; none of their fine proclamations had ever done it, nor would this. None of the facts of the case had been stated. No mention made of the twenty-two gentlemen sent to Ireland for the purpose of investigation, nor of the many other gentlemen who had declared that coercion there would never attain its end. No mention made of the evidence given by Mr. O'Connor of the state of abject poverty of the inhabitants, dying of starvation, and naked in the ditches—an account to harrow up the soul. No mention of the fact, that out of 8,000,000 of the people, only 1,600,000 could get employment, and that of the most wretched description. The point is to remedy this people's great grievances; to give them food or the means of getting it. With respect to tithes, Government had sent its officer, who got up 5,000 different actions for the amount of so many farthings on account of tithes. He had known of proceedings insti-

tuted by the King's attorney for the amount of tithes actually paid. If the hon. Member had been intelligible last session, much trouble and bloodshed would have been spared. The people had committed excesses, it is true, but these excesses they were goaded into. It was a monstrous thing, as the hon. Member for Hull had said, that a set of people should go to an island and carry off all the rents, and expect the people to be quiet. There had been a patience of six hundred years, and a patience of twenty-five years since the union, and all along an ardent desire for separation. There had been a Tory party in Ireland, but it was gone. There was a Whig party, but they must take care that their party did not go off too. It was a dreadful thing to see military going from parish to parish for the protection of an unfortunate cow. (Laughter and cries of Oh!). The army was degraded by such a service. (Oh!). He was present at such a place where two English officers were sent on this duty, and both expressed the greatest dissatisfaction at the service, degrading them to pig-sellers. Besides they were acting contrary to law, for he could prove seizures for tithe in the year 1832. Besides, no magistrate, high or low, has any right to call out the military, except where there is a riot. He remembers reading an old Irish book of a *victorious* circuit made by some judge round Ireland, there being no opposition. His Majesty's Ministers seemed to wish to revive this circuit. The Marquis of Anglesea had expressed himself dissatisfied with the employment of a military force. He himself was attached to the English people, not on account of their wealth and talent, for there was as much talent in Ireland, but on account of their institutions. He trusted that hereafter it would not be adduced, that after 600 years of government, there were two great parties dominant—Tories, who supported the pitch-cap and triangle; and Whigs, who supported the bayonet and bullet. Ireland, he was well convinced, could never be held by such means.

ADJOURNED DEBATE.

Wednesday, 6. Feb.

Mr. MACAULAY said, that last night he had formed the intention of not taking part in the present debate; but circumstances that had this evening arisen determined him to adopt an opposite course, and to say a few words in reply to the attack that had been made upon him by his honourable Friend the Member for Lincoln; at the same time that he felt that he should quite as well discharge the duty which he owed to himself, and much better consult what was due to the House, by postponing the defence of his own personal consistency until after he had more directly addressed himself to the question which mainly occupied the attention of the House. His honourable Friend, so ingenious in the construction of an argument, and so successful in making a point, was sometimes not always aware of the effect of the words which he used. His ho-

nourable Friend told the House that the Government proposed coercion, while the honourable and learned Member for Dublin recommended redress. When called upon to choose between both, the honourable Member for Lincoln declared that he could not hesitate; but he was sure that, upon reflection, his honourable Friend would see that he and the honourable and learned Member for Dublin did not attach the same meaning to the words that the one was the first to use, and that the other had but too readily adopted. The honourable and learned Member for Dublin meant repeal of the union—to that his honourable Friend was adverse. When they were told that the affairs of Ireland ought to be investigated, after the fullest inquiry, and after the gravest debate, he could not help putting the question, whose fault was it that they had no full and formal debate upon the subject? He demanded to know why it was that the question had not been fully agitated? Had not his Majesty's Government given the challenge, and was it not fully in the recollection of the House, that the honourable and learned Member for Dublin had addressed them for two or three hours—he forgot how long, for no one could consider the time long while that gentleman continued speaking; but had he not spoken for hours, without opening the question of the union in a manner that could be grappled with, or indeed fairly encountered at all? This he could not help thinking the more remarkable, when he remembered that that honourable and learned Member had already placed fourteen notices on the book, and that not one of them related to the subject of the legislative union between Great Britain and Ireland. He had no difficulty, then, in saying, that the honourable and learned Member had permitted judgment to go against him by default. Honourable Members at that side of the House (the ministerial) had called upon the honourable and learned Member to proceed, but he had declined the invitation—he shrunk—he skulked from the opportunity of giving effect in that House to the doctrines which he had promulgated elsewhere with so much vehemence, and accompanied with so much of personal invective and abjuration. It was impossible for any man in that House to deny that the honourable and learned Member had not only neglected to take advantage of the opportunity offered to him, but instead of making any approach towards joining issue upon it, he had delivered on the preceding night one of the most evasive speeches that had ever been uttered within the walls of Parliament. From the beginning to the end he had most carefully and studiously avoided meeting the question of the proposed repeal. He should be the last in the world to deny that that speech was not very able and eloquent, but though the most ample opportunity had been afforded the honourable and learned Member by the occasion which then presented itself, to press upon the attention of the House the

question of repeal; yet he had cautiously abstained from improving that opportunity, and had not accepted the challenge of those who stood strong in their defence of the legislative union, the repeal of which was supposed by the Member for Dublin to be the panacea for all the evils with which Ireland was afflicted. Now he (Mr. Macaulay) was prepared to show; that so far from being likely to promote that desirable consummation, it would have the effect of altogether defeating it, and aggravating every one of the causes of discontent at present in operation. If they wished to separate the crowns of England and Ireland—if they desired to establish a Hibernian Republic, their arguments might lay some claim to be considered rational and consistent: but then they were told that the hon. and learned Gentleman required a separation of the legislatures of the two countries, and identity of their crowns—that he was for a separation of the legislatures, and against a separation of the crowns. Could it be, that a mind so acute and informed as his, could be unconscious that its conclusions were opposed to the first principles of the science of government? When a union of the crowns was spoken of, he took it for granted that no such union was meant as that which subsisted between Great Britain and Hanover, in which the crown appertained to the same royal personage, but in which the Ministers by whom the executive authority was actually exercised were perfectly distinct; a union of that sort, so far as he knew, had never been advocated; and he entertained not the slightest doubt, that could such a union ever be called into existence, the first question asked would be, what was the use of continuing it—what purpose could it serve to either country? Let the House only contemplate for a moment what was the nature of the union subsisting between this country and Hanover. Hanover was a member of the Germanic Diet, and might send its contingency to the aid of a war carried on against the allies of England, or against England herself; did they contemplate any union of that sort for Ireland with this country? If they did, let them say so at once—let them declare candidly did they or did they not desire two legislatures and one executive, connected as England and Hanover were, for he professed himself unable to understand, and he felt assured, from the nature of the proposition, that no man in his senses could imagine that he understood any scheme by which the business of government in both countries could be carried on with the legislatures separated and the crowns united. (Cheers, and counter cheers). He was as perfectly aware as any one in that House, that the theory of the British constitution regarded the legislative and executive powers as perfectly distinct; but practical men disregarded such distinctions and proceeded uniformly upon the assumption that they had no real existence—an assumption that every day's experience served but to strengthen and

establish. It was beyond all possibility of cavil or dispute, that those two powers, in the practice of the constitution, were by no means so distinct as the legislative and judicial for example. If they were, there might be some approach to reason in the doctrine maintained on the other side. They might have a Lord Chancellor sitting in Dublin, and another in London—a Court of King's Bench in both places; but be the theory of the constitution what it might, no man acquainted with the working of that constitution could for a moment imagine a total separation of the legislative from the executive. For himself, he was disposed to rest the question upon this issue—Had or had not the legislative a most powerful influence upon the executive? Could the Crown pursue war, or conclude peace, without the consent, and sanction, and support of the legislature? War, peace, and all the functions of the executive, were, in some degree, dependent upon the legislative; or at least it could not be denied that the legislative exerted a considerable share of power in every part of the duties assigned to the executive. True it was that the King might choose his own ministers; but he could scarcely maintain them in office after Parliament had pronounced their condemnation. Doubtless the conduct of negotiations was intrusted to the monarch; but it was well known that the King of this country could not pursue any line of foreign policy for any length of time in opposition to the views and feelings of the Parliament. To all this the advocates of the repeal of the union closed their eyes and ears, declaring that what they desired was to see the executive one and the legislative two. Now the futility of such an opinion could be at once exposed by a most simple, obvious, and familiar illustration:—Suppose the one legislature voted an address in favour of peace, and the other declared for war, what would ensue? Did they suppose that there were to be at all foreign states with which we maintained diplomatic relations two ambassadors—one for England and the other for Ireland? And yet it was impossible to avoid arriving at that conclusion if a distinction were established between the legislative, and therefore of necessity, between the executive powers of the two countries. And what would be the next step? Negotiations might be carried on with foreign states, and the legislature of this country express the highest approbation of the manner in which they might have been conducted—might declare its confidence in, and offer its thanks to, the diplomatic agent employed; while the legislature of the other state might resolve upon his impeachment. Hence, then, he had not the slightest difficulty in saying, that not in not five years would elapse before occasions must present themselves, out of which causes of irreconcilable dispute must arise. It had often been supposed that many parallel cases could be referred to; but when those came to be examined, it would, in every instance, be seen that a similarity of circum-

stances did not prevail; and that where they did, the case but strengthened the position for which he was contending. Let them but take the case of Ireland herself during the short period in which she possessed an independent Parliament. It was only during eighteen years that there did exist in the British empire two independent and co-equal legislatures; and though the circumstances under which they so existed rendered collision exceedingly difficult—for during the whole of that period, as was well known to all who heard him, the Irish Houses were managed by that parliamentary corruption which no one could desire to be renewed, and the Irish people were overawed by a large military force—yet, for all that, so filled was the system with the seeds of disunion, that six years did not elapse from the declaration of independence till occasion for a difference of opinion arose. In the year 1783, George III. was incapacitated by illness from the exercise of the powers appertaining to the kingly office, and according to the constitution the privilege devolved upon the Parliament of making provision for the discharge of all those high and important functions. What occurred? The Parliament of England offered the regency to the Prince of Wales under certain restrictions; the Parliament of Ireland offered him the same powers without any restrictions whatever. Surely if they possessed the right and the power to make such offer respecting the conditions upon which the royal functions were to be exercised, they possessed as fully and could as freely exercise the privilege of selecting the individual to whom the appointment might be offered, and with quite as claim of right constitute the Duke of York Regent, as extend the powers of the office when vested in the Prince of Wales. They unquestionably might have chosen their own regent, and might have invested him with such powers as they thought proper; and had George III. continued for the remainder of his life incapable of the duties of monarch, England and Ireland would have been for two-and-thirty years with a divided executive; and this would have been the unavoidable consequence, which was so loudly deprecated in the very same breath which sent forth a warm recommendation to call into life and activity the causes from which that consequence flowed. (Cheers). Were he to pursue the argument further, he could occupy the attention of the House with nothing more than reciting such a series of monstrous results, as certainly never before ensued, and which were probably never yet contemplated in reference to any public measure. Not only was all argument opposed to it *a priori*, but all history would show the scheme to be founded upon a gross and pernicious fallacy. He admitted that some cases bore the appearances of divided legislatures and united crowns, but those appearances were to the utmost degree deceptive; and the more closely they were examined, the more clearly did

that character develop itself. It might be supposed, for example, that Burgundy and Britany were a case in point; but there it could not fail at once to strike the most cursory observer, that there was no check upon the executive. Let them take another example: Bohemia and the Tyrol, united, so far as the executive was concerned, under the House of Austria; but their legislatures, like those of Britany and Burgundy, existed only in name,—the whole power was vested in the sovereign. The idea of united executives and distinct legislatures was condemned by all reason, and falsified by all experience. (Loud cheers). He felt that in discussing a question of that nature, he had great difficulties to contend with, for no distinct plan had been disclosed to Parliament, nothing specific was proposed; amongst the many crude notions, however, which had been put forth upon the subject, there was one published in the newspapers—he alluded to the project of a federal union, with distinct local Houses of Assembly, and one Supreme Legislature meeting in London. But there just the same difficulties would present themselves; for, under such circumstances, to define the power of each distinct branch of the legislature would be wholly impossible. A difference of opinion between the two Houses of Parliament would be, under any circumstances, bad enough, and present abundance of difficulties. But even for those extreme cases, the constitution had provided a remedy, since the King could dissolve the House of Commons, if such seemed the most expedient course; or create new peers, should his Majesty be so advised. Queen Anne, in 1704, and again in 1711-12, reconciled differences between the two Houses, by the interposition of the royal prerogative. In the case of Lord Aylesbury, she dissolved the House of Commons; and in that of the Treaty of Utrecht, she created new peers. These, however, as the House well knew, were powers that ought to be reserved for extreme cases; but still they were inherent in the monarch, and afforded the means of saving the constitution from wreck, and the nation from an appeal to physical force. But in the case of such a union as that which seemed to enter into the minds of the advocates of the repeal of the existing legislative union, what provision had been made for the effect of those collisions that of necessity must arise before many years could pass away? Of the insufficiency of any such federal union as that which had been mentioned, he need not pass from the present times to find a powerful exemplification. In that great federal union, the constitution of which was not above forty-three or forty-four years old—a constitution which was formed by men who, though opposed to the rule of the mother country, were now never mentioned here otherwise than with reverence—they had at the present moment a striking and practical confirmation of the truth, that unions of the nature to be established by the proposed repeal could end

in nothing but disappointment and dissension. The principles of that union were laid down and established by that convention at which Washington himself presided; and yet, after the comparatively short period of forty-three years, they were now dissolving; and were spreading, in the act of that dissolution, all the evils that of necessity flow from division and its immediate concomitant—weakness. Impossible, then, as it would be to define the powers of the local legislature, as compared with the imperial—unprovided as the authors of such a plan were with the means of obviating the mischiefs which must ensue from collision, otherwise than by an appeal to physical force—he hesitated not to say, that a total and immediate separation of the two countries would be far preferable to any such scheme. The hon. and learned Member for Dublin had often said, that he should regret the complete separation of the two countries, as a grievous calamity; but he believed it would not be disputed for a moment by any intelligent or impartial man, that the immediate effect of the arrangement which that hon. and learned Gentleman had in view would be speedily to bring about and irreversibly to establish that separation which he professed to be most anxious to avoid. If the separation of the two countries could not be prevented, let that be at once candidly and manfully acknowledged, and let the people of both countries prepare, as they best might, for the separation thus said to be inevitable. But so long as he had a voice in the councils of this country, no consideration should induce him to consent to laying the foundation, according as the Member for Dublin would recommend, for an eventual separation under circumstances which could not fail to be deeply disastrous. To that member he should then make his appeal—to him who now boasted that he stood between the Government of this country and a civil war—and he would tell him that he grievously mistook the present position of affairs in Ireland, if he imagined that it was anything less than civil war; nay, to the mind of every reflecting man, it presented an aspect infinitely more painful and dangerous than many of those conditions of society which were termed states of civil war. He trusted that no one would suppose, when he took this view of the subject, that he was insensible to the great evils which entered into all the relations of social life in Ireland—to the crying grievance long unredressed, of which the people of that country had reason to complain. When he heard the hon. and learned Member going through the list of those evils, but furnishing for them no speedy remedy except the repeal of the union, he could not but ask himself this question—whether those evils had an earlier date than the year 1800? He could not but suppose that in the mind of the hon. and learned Member for Dublin there existed no distinction between coincidence and causation—that

he was prone to argue *pro hoc, ergo propter hoc*. But in another point of view, the honourable and learned Gentleman seemed to reverse the argument, and instead of saying that Tenterden steeple was the cause of Godwin Sands, took it into his head to suppose that Godwin Sands were the cause of Tenterden steeple. In effect, he seemed to contend that, as there were certain local grievances, there should therefore be a local legislature. Before the revision of the Welsh judicature in that House, they had heard loud and bitter complaints of the mischief which in that part of the empire flowed from the imperfect manner in which justice was administered. But was there any human being irrational enough to contend that such a state of things warranted a legislative separation? He had himself, times out of number, complained of the local grievances affecting the Duchy of Cornwall; but would any man gravely assert, on that account the county of Cornwall should be the seat of an independent legislative body? The town which he represented complained, with great justice perhaps—with great earnestness, certainly—of the inconvenience it suffered from the peculiar constitution of its corporate body; but it never entered into the minds of the good people of Leeds to seek for a remedy according to the prescription of the hon. and learned Member for Dublin. (Cheers). He would beg of the House to recall to mind, if it had ever made itself acquainted with the arguments which the hon. and learned Member used elsewhere, or which, if not used by him, were certainly urged by other advocates of repeal: and they would perceive that not one of them was inapplicable to a legislative separation between the north and the south of Ireland. Between those two parts of that island there were all those differences of religion, of race, of habits, of civilization, and of every distinction on which stress had been laid, either by him or his supporters. The honourable and learned Gentleman had maintained that however the present executive and legislative Government of England might be disliked by the Protestants of Ireland, they detested the Catholics still more; and that in any case where the conviction of a Catholic was desired, they only needed to fill the jury-box with Protestants. Would not that circumstance of itself be sufficient to warrant the consistent, but at the same time most absurd conclusion, that there should be for Ireland herself one House of Assembly sitting in Derry, to give effect to the sentiments of Protestants; and another establishment in Cork, to give effect to Catholic feeling, and maintain Catholic interests? (Cheers). These brief remarks, he believed, constituted the best vindication he could offer for his own personal consistency, and the best defence that he could lay before the House of those passages which had been read from speeches of his made during the discussion of the Reform Bill. He did hope that the House, in considering the sentiments of even so humble

an individual as he was, would construe them according to the occasion; and that, in using general arguments, their appositeness would be fairly tried. His honourable Friend, the member for Lincoln, was too good a scholar not to know that general and abstract arguments might be applied with equal skill by the same individual to one side of a question, and that equally forcible arguments might be used by that identical person on the other side. He had no doubt that the academic experience of his hon. Friend could furnish him with many anecdotes of these penned on both sides, of almost any question usually offered for such discussions. He would also be ready to acknowledge that the force and value of arguments depended altogether upon their appositeness. The same speech might certainly be made for Thistlewood and the Cato-street conspirators on the one hand, and for Russell and Sydney on the other; but then, could indifferent persons overlook the difference between the two cases? His hon. Friend must believe as he did, that the whole of the agitation which had been excited respecting the union was a mere delusion—the measure fortunately was impossible, since any approximation to success in such a case could be nothing less than ruin to both countries, and to no part of the empire more completely destructive than to Ireland herself. It was beyond all possibility of dispute, that nine-tenths of the evils of which Ireland had to complain arose out of misgovernment; but were they therefore to submit to outrages against all law, and offences against the first principles of justice? Agricultural property had been in many places destroyed in England, and much of that had arisen from a long-continued course of misgovernment; but was the dignity of the law not therefore to be vindicated, and were the offenders to go unpunished? If the revenue laws were faulty, as in many cases they were, were smugglers to go unpunished, and remain at perfect liberty to shoot revenue officers when and where they thought proper? He acknowledged, that from the possible rejection of the Reform Bill he had anticipated outrage and violence; but were the men who burned Bristol therefore to go unpunished? Out of the hon. Member's own mouth would he judge him. He told them that things had come to such a pass, that nothing less than decisive measures would do; but at the same time he told his Majesty's Government, that if matters arrived at a certain point, he should, however reluctantly, join their ranks and afford them the support which the occasion might require—then between him and his hon. Friend it was a mere question of time, since upon principle they fully agreed; he being prepared in a certain imaginable case to do all that the most zealous supporter of the existing union could desire. His hon. Friend demanded redress for the people of Ireland. Could he on such a point differ from his hon. Friend? He hesitated not to declare that he should hold office

under no Government which had not pledged itself to a redress of grievances; but they had now not only to redress grievances, but to deal with something worse than civil war—they had to deal with a people, where in one county, in the course of the year, no fewer than sixty murders and attempts at murder were committed, and 600 burglaries. Why that was equal to the sack of three or four towns. He had no difficulty in declaring that he should infinitely rather be in the midst of what was called civil war—he should much prefer to have been in the line of march of the Pretender's army, in the year 1745, when the Chevalier St. George marched through Carlisle or the other towns he entered, than reside in Ireland under such circumstances. It was idle to deny that the present condition of Ireland was something worse than civil war. But they were threatened with the universal demand of the people of Ireland for repeal. Was that cry more formidable than others which they had cheerfully encountered? The men who had faced the cry of "No Popery!" had nothing to apprehend from any clamour that might be raised in the present times; they were not likely to shrink from the shout of "Repeal." The time he felt assured would come when Ireland would do justice to her sincere and honest friends; to the men who for her sake quitted office in the year 1807, and remained shut out from her for twenty years, that she might receive a full measure of justice. Those were men not likely to quit under a temporary show of unpopularity, who had encountered its reality for so many years; who had endured the frowns of the Court, and the hisses of the multitude; who had foregone power, honour, and emolument, without even enjoying the compensation of popularity: those were not the men to be scared from the strict line of duty by anything which a temporary and evanescent discontent might occasion. (Loud and continued cheering). Amongst them were those who might have obtained not only seats in the House, but in the Cabinet, were they only willing to utter one word against the Catholic claims, and who, rather than utter that little word, encountered the fiercest abuse, and submitted to the most unsparing censure; and who, ere they would depart from the principles upon which they took their stand, retired into private life, and relinquished all the views of an honourable ambition, that they might not betray the cause in which the hon. and learned Member for Dublin had so deep an interest. To promote that interest the individuals who now formed the administration of Lord Grey, incurred the disapprobation and the hostility which excluded them from office for a quarter of a century, and that for the purpose of placing the hon. and learned Member for Dublin where he then was. He (Mr. Macaulay), according to his station and abilities, might be reckoned one of the number who struggled against the adverse feelings of the great and the buzzes of the multitude, in

order that the Member for Dublin should not be less than a British subject, and he was prepared to encounter equal reproach, obloquy, and deprivation, in order to prevent his ever becoming more. (Loud and long-continued cheering). He had now the happiness and the honour, under a new regime, to represent thousands of constituents, and he believed he spoke their sentiments on that occasion—sentiments which, he had the best reason for knowing, were not inconsistent with his holding office under the present administration; and he rejoiced to live in an age and country where the duties of a representative of the people were not inconsistent with those of a servant of the crown. In the discharge then, of his duties in both capacities, he felt perfect satisfaction in giving his assent to that part of the address which pledged the House, with the blessing of God, to use every effort for the continuance of that union which now happily subsisted between this country and Ireland, for supporting the rights of property, maintaining order, and preserving the fabric of society. (Enthusiastic cheering).

Mr O'CONNELL wished to say a few words in explanation, to which he would strictly confine himself. The hon. Member who spoke last had entirely mistaken his argument. He (Mr. Macaulay) had said, that he (Mr. O'Connell), after having detailed existing grievances in Ireland, attributed them to the legislative union; and that he had argued against that union by reason of those grievances. This was a total misapprehension; for he (Mr. O'Connell) had addressed the entire of his speech to that part of the address from the throne which related to the great increase of disturbances in Ireland. His argument was, that property was rendered insecure, and insubordination and violence produced, by the grievances he enumerated; and so little had he said of the union, that he had been actually taunted with having left it out of the question.

Mr. SHEIL said there was a practical antithesis, amounting to contradiction, in the course pursued by the Member for Leeds (Mr. Macaulay); for while he enters into a most elaborate discussion on the union, which he assumes is unpremeditated, he supports an address which recommends the extinction of all argument, puts an end to debate, strikes Ireland dumb, and claps a padlock on her lips, though it never can stop the throbbings of her big and indignant heart. (Hear, hear, hear). What a strange proceeding on the part of the Member for Leeds—to discuss the question himself, and to deny eight millions the right to entertain it—to recommend the suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act, in order to commit all argument in Ireland to incarceration, while he himself wantons and luxuriates in so wide a field of discursive expatiation. (Hear, hear, hear). Perhaps he conceives that he has advanced arguments so irresistible—that his dialectics are so convincing—that there

is such a power of reasoning, amounting to demonstration, in his speech, that he has put an end to all doubt, extinguished scepticism as effectually as the address suppresses liberty, closed the door on all dispute, and established conviction on the basis of immutable and deeply-founded truth. One could, however, have desired that, having taken the subject in hand, he had touched on some topics which appear to us not irrelevant—that he had adverted to the fiscal and moral evils of absenteeism, had explained the causes of the misery and destitution of Ireland, had exhibited the advantages of our provincial dependence, and shown us the benefits of having the English members overwhelm on Irish questions the majority of Irish members in this House: but instead of doing so, he delights us with an enchanting allusion, derived from the Siamese Twins. (Cheers and laughter). But while the honourable Gentleman thus gave way to the spirit of fanciful illustration, he was unconsciously offending us with an image of our calamitous condition. We are indeed linked in an unfortunate brotherhood; tied together with no ligature through which the vital principle of international feeling can circulate (hear, hear, hear)—bound with a reciprocity of inconvenience, and irritated by the common inconveniences resulting from our junction. (Cheers). How, then, could the honourable Member for Leeds indulge in this metaphorical *mal-apropos*? At first he (Mr. Sheil) could not account for it, but on application, he recollected that the honourable Member had answered the speech of the distinguished author of "The Siamese Twins." His habits as a critic interfered with his political purpose, and the image presented by the work of Mr. Bulwer was so much pressed upon his memory, that he rushed into a simile that refutes his argument, and furnishes us with the best picture of our melancholy condition. (Cheers). The honourable Gentleman had referred to the favours conferred on Ireland by the Whigs. (Hear, hear). He (Mr. Sheil) was most prompt to recognise them, and, above all, to offer his homage to the vast services conferred by Lord Grey, who had always proved himself the devoted friend of Ireland.

Mr. O'CONNELL.—No, no!

Mr. SHEIL. At all events, he was so at the discussion of the union. (Hear, hear). Charles Grey (and between Lord Grey and Charles Grey there was little difference) opposed the union. He predicted the evils that would result from it, and almost drew a picture of the scenes which are now passing before our eyes. So far, therefore, from dissenting from the panegyric on Lord Grey, every Irishman should concur in encompassing him with enthusiasm. What a pity it is, for Lord Grey's sake, that the Member for Leeds is so young a man; had he been beside him in 1799, he, of course, would have urged, with convincing effect, all the arguments which he has advanced with such force, and Lord Grey would

never have given utterance to language so entirely at variance with the opinion of the Member for Leeds. The following is an extract from his speech, which does not apply exclusively to the past, but is prospective, and supplies an argument for repeal. Lord Grey said, on the 7. of February, 1799 (it is reported in page 338 of the 34th volume of Hansard)—"What I most heartily wish for is, a union between the two countries. By union I mean something more than a mere word—a union not of parliaments, but of hearts, affections, and interests—a union of vigour, of ardour and zeal for the general welfare of the British Empire. It is this species of union, and this only, that can tend to increase the real strength of the empire, and give it security against any danger. But if any measure, with the name only of union be proposed, and the tendency of which would be only to disunite us, to create disaffection, distrust, and jealousy, it can only tend to weaken the whole of the British Empire. Of this nature do I take the present measure to be. Discontent, distrust, jealousy, and suspicion, are the visible fruits of it already. If you persist in it, resentment will follow, and although you should be able, which I doubt, to obtain a seeming consent of the Parliament of Ireland to the measure, yet the people of that country would wait for an opportunity of recovering their rights, which they will say were taken from them by force." (Loud cheers from the Irish members). Is not this prophetic? Is not this the language of a man anticipating repeal, and almost supporting it? How can this language be reconciled to the speech of the Gentleman who spoke from the Treasury bench; and, what is far more important, to the Speech which Lord Grey has been supposed to dictate to his Majesty? And what does that Speech recommend? An entire suppression of all reasoning on the subject. It enjoins silence. It says, not only shall you not have repeal, but you shall not dare to demand it. The Habeas Corpus Act is to be suspended—the principles of British liberty are to be trampled under foot—the prerogative is to be strengthened—the sceptre is to be laden with iron—what was carried by corruption is to be secured by oppression;—nay, more the boast of Britons—the pride of the sustinment—the ornament and the prop of the constitution, of all that we hold valuable and dear—the trial by jury is to be at an end. (Loud cheers). Good God! Is it Lord Grey, just fresh from the triumph of reform, who recommends this? Oh, no!—there is, there must be some superior spirit of domination in the Cabinet, who exercises a fatal ascendancy, and is the evil genius of Ireland. (Hear, hear.) But he (Mr. Sheil) had not done with appeals to the authority of Lord Grey. It was pleasurable to refer to him. Lord Grey, in the same speech says, "Look at the history of Ireland, and you will find, that had it not been for British councils and British intrigue, none, or at least few of the evils which

are now so much felt there would have taken place, evils of which Government is the parent, and which are now made the reason for taking away all semblance of liberty from the Irish people." (Loud cheers from the Irish members). Let us see how far this position answers to our present calamities and our crimes. How is the Government constituted? There is not one Irishman in the Cabinet of Ireland. The Lord Lieutenant, the Under-Secretary, the Private Secretary, the Commander of the Forces, the Adjutant-General, and, above all, the Cabinet Minister who plays so inferior a part to Lord Anglesea, are English. In this House there is not a single native of Ireland, who represents an Irish county or borough, who has any concern with the affairs of his country. You have not one single link between the Irish representatives of Ireland and yourselves. The late Member for Limerick represents Cambridge; the noble Lord, the late Member for Kilkenny, represents Northampton. It may be said that the Member for Dungarvon (Mr. Lamb) is in office. Ireland has not the honour of his birth. By the way, the hon. Gent. on the hustings, remanded by the patriotic fishermen who returned him, declared that though he would not make the repeal pledge, his mind was open to conviction, and he would give the subject every consideration. It is to be presumed that the King's speech has convinced him, and he will now consider his engagement fulfilled; and after mature official meditation, he will vote for the extinction of all future debate, having arrived at a conclusion from which all the logicians at Dungarvon can never move him. But, to revert to more important matter, and putting all questions of office aside, and waiving all circumstances which remind us of our provincial dependence, who is the Secretary of Ireland? A man who was examined before a committee of this House, and declared that he knew nothing of Ireland. (Hear, hear). He is to be charged with ignorance, and ignorance is almost an offence. He is blind, and is to lead, or rather drag, Ireland on the edge of the gulf. What sort of defence of himself did he yesterday make? Did he tell us why out of 26 stipendiary magistrates named by this Government, not one Catholic was appointed? (Hear, hear). Did he tell us why the Government gave no hint to the Irish judges (not à la Saurin to Lord Norbury), but a useful inuendo, not to outrage the Irish Catholics by frustrating Catholic emancipation? But he says he cannot influence the judges. What! when two chief judges are of his own nomination. (Cheers). But wherefore did he pack the juries at the late Clonmel Assizes? Has he answered that? How stand the facts? A jury bill is promised. The Chancellor of the Exchequer pledges himself to it. He cannot carry it; and then, in opposition to the principles of that bill, in violation of a solemn pledge, the juries who try the tithe combinators are picked and chosen in the worst

spirit of sectarian exclusion; the feelings of the Roman Catholics are outraged, the most fatal habits of ascendancy are revived, and our tribunals are degraded into a factious and exasperating instrumentality, to carry a verdict at any cost of principle, at any hazard of result. (Cheers). He (Mr. Sheil) would defy contradiction on this head. He asserted that the Crown had set aside 36 Catholics, and impanelled three juries, with 12 Protestants in one, and 11 Protestants in each of the other two (loud cries of hear); and who did this? The Crown. The law-officers confessed it. They claimed all the merit as their own. Is this supportable? Is this to be endured? Is this consistent with the principles professed by Lord Brougham, when he presented a petition of the Irish Catholics, detailing enormities of this sort, and when he denounced these detestable practices? And can you wonder that Ireland is in this frightful condition? And will you repress the consequences of your fatal misrule with your offensive, insulting, and tyrannical legislation? But you have measures of relief. What relief? (Loud cheers) Of what kind? The church is the question. Has the Irish Secretary given way? Has he renounced his principles? How do he and the noble Lord (the paymaster of the forces) settle these matters between them? The one exclaims, "I will never allow church property to be touched!" The other virtually voted for its confiscation in 1824. Well, how do these Siamese youths now comport themselves together? Look at them, it is in truth a pleasant picture (loud laughter)—there they stand on their four legs, as the Member for Leeds has it (rare quadrupeds in the zoology of office), bound together not by the vile ligature of office, but fastened in their amiable fraternity by noble love of that country to whose benefit they so much contribute by their affectionate coalition. But how will they settle the great point of former difference? The Member for the Tower Hamlets indulged in a natural curiosity on this subject. He asked, "When we see the penalties, tell us, for God's sake, what is to be the relief—what will you do for Ireland?" "Wait," is the answer: and will Englishmen tarry for the redress of grievances which they confess, and precipitate the infliction of punishment for the madness which they have themselves excited? He had done—yet, one word more: the speech deprecates civil war, at its onset, in Portugal. Englishmen! do not confine your sympathies to your allies. We are your countrymen; our blood is as precious as any which can be shed upon a distant shore! save, save us in the name of justice, of humanity, and of the obligations which you once conferred upon us, by wise and timely redress of our insupportable grievances, from a war which will be worse than civil, and to which the hoarded wrongs of centuries, and the rancours of religious hatred will lend their infernal and horrible contribution. (Cheers).

7. February.

Mr. HUME spoke at considerable length, Mr. CORBETT for an hour and a quarter, and then followed Sir ROBERT PEEL in a speech of two hours' length. There is not time for more than this slight mention of the speeches. The House *again adjourned*, as many more gentlemen showed a desire to speak upon this question. An attempt was made to come to a division; but no division took place, except on the motion whether there should be the adjournment, which being carried in the affirmative, Mr. O'CONNELL was prepared to move again, and then the House consented to adjourn.

TO MY READERS.

I WAS mistaken about the mode of sending up petitions. If *left open at both ends*, a parcel containing a petition, and directed to any member of Parliament, *at the House of Commons*, it will come free of postage to such member.

From the LONDON GAZETTE,

FRIDAY, FEB. 1, 1833.

INSOLVENT.

SAVAGE, E., Stratford, Essex, cheesemonger.

BANKRUPTS.

BARON, J., Frome Selwood, Somersetshire, innholder.
 CARELESS, W., Charlton, Kent, cheesemonger.
 COULTHARD, R. and T., Crown-street, Finsbury, woollen-draper.
 FLETCHER, S., Hackney-wick, blanket-manufacturer.
 FRIEND, G., Great Charlotte-street, Lambeth, victualler.
 HAWKES, T. T., Frome Selwood, Somersetshire, money-scrivener.
 LEWIS, H. I., Barbican, tallow-chandler.
 MARTIN, E., and T. C. Barker, Regent's-park-basin, Marybonne, coal-merchants.
 RELFE, S. S., Bell's-buildings, Salisbury-square, coal-merchant.

SANDERS, E., Worcester, builder.
 TARRANT, S., Regent-st., wine-merchant.
 TIDSWELL, T., and T. Thorp, Cheadle, Cheshire, calico-printers.

TUESDAY, FEB. 5, 1833.

INSOLVENT.

RICHMOND, C., John-street, Adelphi, coal-merchant.

BANKRUPTCIES SUPERSEDED.

LEE, W., Arundel-street, Strand, commission-agent.
 POWER, R. J. W., Havant, Hants, fellmonger.
 SHAW, J., Great St. Helen's, general dealer.

BANKRUPTS.

ALDERSON, R., Crawford-st., Marybonne, linen-draper.
 CHANNING, J., North Petherton, Somersetshire, victualler.
 CLAYTON, W., Cheapside, carpet-warehouseman.
 CONSTANTINE, S., Sheffield, cutler.
 EARLL, W., Birmingham, victualler.
 FREEMAN, J. jun., Drayton, Somersetshire, tinman.
 FURNESS, M., Great Longstone, Derbyshire, cheese-factor.
 LANCE, W., Lewisham, victualler.
 PARNELL, T., Manchester, laceman.
 WOOD, J., Austonley, Yorkshire, cloth-manuf.

SCOTCH SEQUESTRATIONS.

FERGUSON, D., and A. Fairlie, Milncroft, Glasgow, calico-printers.
 KIRKWOOD, J. & J. jun., Glasgow, builders.

LONDON MARKETS.

MARK-LANE, CORN-EXCHANGE, Feb. 4.—The supplies up to this morning's market from Kent were again large, but from Essex and Suffolk moderate. These fresh arrivals, however, added to the parcels left over from Friday, exhibited a tolerably full show on the stands. The weather has affected the condition of the wheats, and the samples generally were not so even in quality as latterly. The market was thinly attended, and the trade throughout ruled very dull and inactive; and although there were one or two buyers from the North, yet little inclination was evinced by them or the town millers to purchase. Good dry wheats moved slowly off hand, at a decline of 1s. per qr., and all secondary and damp lots were full 2s. per qr. lower, and at

this decline only a limited clearance was effected. Old wheats were extremely dull, and nominally unaltered in value. In bonded nothing doing.

The arrivals of barley being large, the trade was still further depressed. Bright malting qualities maintained their former currencies, but all other descriptions were 1s. cheaper.

The extensive importation of oats, particularly Irish, since Friday, has rendered the trade excessively heavy, and no progress could be made towards a clearance, unless by submitting to a decline of 6d. per qr. on Friday's, or 1s. on Monday's rates.

In malt little or no business transpiring.

Old beans were without alteration, but few ticks were purchased at 30s., making a reduction of 1s. per qr. on the terms of this day week, and the trade very languid.

Good boiling peas supported their quotations; hog and grey dull, and rather lower.

In flour no alteration.

Wheat	56s. to 60s.
Rye	32s. to 35s.
Barley	22s. to 23s.
— fine	30s. to 33s.
Peas, White	32s. to 34s.
— Boilers	38s. to 40s.
— Grey	34s. to 35s.
Beans, Small	—s. to —s.
— Tick	28s. to 31s.
Oats, Scotch Potato	23s. to 25s.
— Feed	14s. to 18s.
Flour, per sack	48s. to 50s.

PROVISIONS.

Bacon, Middles, new, —s. to —s. per cwt.	
— Sides, new ... —s. to —s.	
Pork, India, new 126s. 0d. to —s.	
— Mess, new ... 75s. 0d. to —s. per barl.	
Butter, Belfast 84s. to —s. per cwt.	
— Carlow 80s. to 88s.	
— Cork 80s. to 82s.	
— Limerick .. —s. to —s.	
— Waterford.. 76s. to 80s.	
— Dublin 74s. to 76s.	
Cheese, Cheshire 50s. to 70s.	
— Gloucester, Double.. 50s. to 62s.	
— Gloucester, Single.. 46s. to 50s.	
— Edam 48s. to 50s.	
— Gouda 48s. to 50s.	
Hams, Irish..... 50s. to 60s.	

SMITHFIELD.—Feb. 4.

This day's supply of each kind of stock was limited; but the trade was, owing to advanced prices being generally and stiffly demanded, throughout very dull; with beef at an advance, and veal at a depression, of full 2d. per stone; with mutton and pork at fully Friday's quotations.

The beasts, which were, in common with other parts of the supply, of fair average quality, consisted of about equal numbers of short-horns, Devons, Herefords, Welch runts, and Scots, or Norfolk home-breds, for the most part oxen and steers, chiefly from Lincolnshire, Leicestershire, Northamptonshire, and Norfolk; with a few from Essex, Suffolk, and Cambridgeshire, and our western and midland districts; with about 50 Sussex beasts, say 200 Town's-end cows, a few Staffords, &c., from sundry quarters.

Full three-fifths of the sheep were new Leicesters, of the South Down and white-faced crosses, in the proportion of about two of the former to five of the latter; about one-fifth South Downs; and the remaining fifth about equal numbers of Kents, Kentish half-breds, and old Leicesters; with a few old Lincolns, horned and polled Norfolks, horned and polled Scotch and Welch sheep, horned Dorsets, &c.

Beasts, 2,242; sheep, 14,630; calves, 96; pigs, 136.

MARK-LANE.—Friday, Feb. 8.

The arrivals are large. The prices are lower, notwithstanding, there is very little business doing.

THE FUNDS.

3 per Cent.	Fri.	Sat.	Mon.	Tues.	Wed.	Thur.
Cons. Ann.	88	88½	88½	87½	87½	88½

COBBETT'S MAGAZINE, a Monthly Review of Politics, History, Science, Literature, Arts, &c. &c. published 1. February. The Contents of the Number for this Month are as follow:—1. Will it be Suffered to Work?—2. Portraits of the Senate.—3. La Huitaine, with Translation.—4. The "Swish Multitude."—5. The Masque of Anarchy, a Poem.—6. Review: "Journal of a Naturalist."—7. Population and Employment.—8. Patriotism; or, our Love for and Duty to our Country.—9. Lectures on Music, with Concerted Illustrations.—10. The Leading Newspaper Press.—11. The Flight of Israel; a Fragment.—12. On the Present State of the Country, with regard to the Debt and the Taxes.—13. Banim's Novels.—14. The Dutch War.—15. Scenes in the Sister Island.—16. The Irish Monthly Magazine.—17. Going to Sea.—18. Ireland.—19. Mr. O'Connell's Letter.—20. Sonnet.—21. "Annual Parliaments, Universal Suffrage, and Vote by Ballot."—22. What Properties a Parliament Man should have.

Published at No. 11, Bolt-court, Fleet-street; and by Effingham Wilson, Royal Exchange. To be had of Newsmen and Booksellers throughout the country.

Printed by William Cobbett, Johnson's-court: and published by him, at 11, Bolt court, Fleet street.